

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, August 3, 1912.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-living God, we would approach Thee in the spirit of Him who taught us to pray: Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to provide transportation for American citizens fleeing from threatened danger in the Republic of Mexico.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4663) granting to the Washington-Oregon Corporation a right for an electric railroad and for telephone, telegraph, and electric-transmission lines across the Vancouver Military Reservation, in the State of Washington.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to provide transportation for American citizens fleeing from threatened danger in the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 15509. An act to authorize the construction of a sewer pipe upon and across the Fort Rodman Military Reservation at New Bedford, Mass.; and

H. R. 24450. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 4663. An act granting to the Washington-Oregon Corporation a right for an electric railroad, and for telephone, telegraph, and electric-transmission lines across the Vancouver Military Reservation, in the State of Washington.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LLOYD rose.

The SPEAKER. The special order for to-day is that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] shall have an hour, immediately after the approval of the Journal, in which to answer the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG].

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with the understanding that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] is to occupy half an hour on some matters, and that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] will present a conference report, I yield.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there is no understanding about the matter, but I have no objection to the gentleman temporarily yielding.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would rule, if it came up at all, that the conference report would have the right of way over everything.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged report in respect to an election-contest case, from the Committee on Elections No. 3, which I would like to present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to yield the right of way for the conference report, unless I understand what the gentleman desires.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. It is the case of Jodoin against Higgins.

The SPEAKER. And the gentleman wants to make a report?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Yes; and to move the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is it a unanimous report?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Then the understanding is that I am to proceed after that is over, and after the gentleman from Missouri presents the matter from the Committee on Accounts, to take not to exceed 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama presents the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Yes. The strict letter of the rule is that the gentleman may proceed now, but the understanding is that as soon as the matter referred to by the gentleman from New York is attended to, and the gentleman from Missouri presents a resolution, and the gentleman from Alabama gets through with the conference report, the gentleman from Texas may proceed.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE OF JODOIN AGAINST HIGGINS.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Elections No. 3, I present a privileged report in the case of Raymond J. Jodoin against Edwin W. Higgins, a contested-election case from the third congressional district of the State of Connecticut, and move the adoption of the resolutions recommended by the committee, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 661 (H. Rept. 1136).

Resolved, That Raymond J. Jodoin was not elected a Member of the Sixty-second Congress from the third congressional district of Connecticut and is not entitled to a seat therein.

House resolution 662 (H. Rept. 1136).

Resolved, That Edwin W. Higgins was elected a Member of the Sixty-second Congress from the third congressional district of Connecticut and is entitled to a seat therein.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York states that this is a unanimous report, and unless objection is made the Chair will put the motion on both resolutions. [After a pause.] The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The resolutions were agreed to.

HERMAN GAUSS.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 562 (H. Rept. 1133).

Resolved, That there be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Herman Gauss the sum of \$600 for expert and extra services rendered to the Committee on Invalid Pensions from March 4 until October 8, 1911, as examiner by detail from the Pension Bureau, pursuant to law.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ALLEN D. ALBERT.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I also present the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 555 (H. Rept. 1134).

Resolved, That there be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Allen D. Albert the sum of \$1,200 for services rendered to the Committee on Invalid Pensions for the second session of the Sixty-second Congress as examiner by detail from the Pension Bureau, pursuant to law.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment to that resolution which I desire to offer, to strike out, in lines 2 and 3, the words "one thousand two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "six," so that it will read "\$600" instead of "\$1,200."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman that it is customary to give \$500 to these examiners.

Mr. LLOYD. No; \$600.

Mr. MANN. I have looked at it, and I think it is in the usual form.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is customary to include \$500 in the appropriation bill, and has been for years, for Mr. Gauss.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York is mistaken about that. Mr. Gauss was paid in the last Congress \$2,400.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, in order that that may be understood, Mr. Gauss has heretofore been allowed from time to time through the Committee on Accounts \$1,200 for his services for several years past. He began service in this Congress on the 4th of March of last year and concluded on the 8th day of October of last year, covering a period of about seven months,

for which time he asks \$600. That has been allowed in previous resolutions.

Now, this resolution provides pay for Mr. Albert, who has performed duty during this session of Congress, and allows the same amount of \$600.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the resolution in lines 2 and 3 by striking out "\$1,200" and inserting "\$600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

JOSEPH M. MCCOY.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 559 (H. Rept. 1137).

Resolved, That there be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Joseph M. McCoy, the sum of \$1,200 for services rendered to the Committee on Pensions for the first and second sessions of the Sixty-second Congress as examiner by detail from the Pension Bureau, pursuant to law.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the committee offers the following amendment: In line 3, strike out the words "two hundred," so that the resolution will provide for the payment of \$1,000 instead of \$1,200.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the resolution by striking out, in line 3, the words "two hundred."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The resolution as amended was agreed to.

STEEL TRUST INVESTIGATION.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 632 (H. Rept. 1135).

Resolved, That the sum of \$1,000 shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, on vouchers ordered by the committee appointed under the resolution of the House of Representatives adopted May 16, 1911, to make an investigation for the purpose of ascertaining whether there have occurred violations by the United States Steel Corporation, or other corporations or persons, of the antitrust act of July 2, 1890, and the acts supplementary thereto, the various interstate-commerce acts, and the acts relative to the national banking associations, etc.; and that all vouchers ordered by said committee shall be signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts, evidenced by the signature of the chairman thereof.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, is this the final allowance for the steel investigating committee?

Mr. STANLEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. How much does it make altogether?

Mr. STANLEY. Thirty-nine thousand dollars.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky know how much the printing bill has amounted to?

Mr. STANLEY. That is not presented to this committee.

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. STANLEY. There is a resolution for 10,000 copies of the hearings. Those hearings were not sent out on the instance of members of the committee, only 200 or 300 of them. They were only sent out on requests, and we received requests for about 5,000 daily.

Mr. MANN. How many were printed?

Mr. STANLEY. There were some 6,000 printed, just enough to keep ahead. The rest will be printed and bound and be for distribution. There was an authorization for 10,000.

Mr. MANN. I think there was an authorization for 10,000, but I do not think it was understood they would all be printed unless required.

Mr. STANLEY. I think the authorization gave the right to print and bind the rest if necessary.

Mr. MANN. I do not so recall, but the gentleman may be correct. Has there been any estimate at the Printing Office of what the amount of printing is?

Mr. STANLEY. I have not received such estimate.

Mr. MANN. What occasion is there for binding 5,000?

Mr. STANLEY. There will not be that many. The pamphlet form, with back numbers, continues to come in. I think I have received 600 or 800 requests already for copies in bound form from various sources.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Does this provide for the printing?

Mr. LLOYD. This has nothing to do with the printing.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

CHARLES L. WILLIAMS AND MARSHALL PICKERING.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, House resolution 565.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 565.

Resolved, That there shall be paid to Charles L. Williams and Marshall Pickering, respectively, as special messengers in the majority and minority caucus rooms, \$1,200 per annum each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for how long—forever?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York seems to be asking the gentleman from Missouri a question.

Mr. LLOYD. I did not hear his question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman how long this is to be.

Mr. LLOYD. One year.

Mr. MANN. This is only an authorization. The gentleman from New York will have to settle that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understood it to provide for the payment.

Mr. LLOYD. No; it is just an authorization.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

STEEL TRUST INVESTIGATION.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at 11 o'clock, the House convene and proceed with the consideration of the report of the majority (H. Rept. 1127) and the various reports of the minority investigating the affairs of the steel corporation—it would perhaps be more proper to say a discussion of it—from 11 o'clock until 5, and then to consider it at a night session from 8 o'clock until 11.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that on next Thursday—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Kentucky in his request to except from the order conference reports and appropriation bills. I do not think we can agree to any order at this time that would give anything the right of way over conference reports and appropriation bills.

Mr. STANLEY. I accept the suggestion.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have had before the House the consideration of H. R. 23673, the seamen's bill, all of which has been read, I believe, except two paragraphs. To me this is emergency legislation, and I believe that this House is properly going to be open to just criticism unless the bill is taken up and passed in time for the Senate to act upon it before Congress adjourns. This is largely due to the fact that we have recently had the great ocean disaster, with the loss of many lives, which a law of this kind, had it been passed before that disaster, would have averted. The lives of many seamen are jeopardized under the present system, and it seems to me that this House ought to find time in the very near future, not later than next Thursday, at least, to take up and pass that bill. It should not take more than an hour's time. Therefore I would like to ask especially the Democratic Members of the House, as well as those on the Republican side who are interested in this matter, to help us get this bill before the House, when it will possibly take less than an hour for its consideration and passage, and get it to the Senate.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] a question. Does this report come in the nature of legislation? Is it in the form of a bill?

Mr. STANLEY. No; there will be no bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it expected the House will vote?

Mr. STANLEY. No.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The question is just to set aside time for discussion of it?

Mr. STANLEY. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to object. I believe it is a matter of great interest to have the steel report discussed, but I am getting in about the position where, unless there is some sincere effort made here to get this bill up and secure its passage, I shall have to object to unanimous consent in the future.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suppose what the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] desires is to have authority on Thursday next to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for general debate upon the report of the steel investigating committee?

Mr. STANLEY. That is it.

Mr. MANN. Now, the gentleman couples with his request not to meet at 11 o'clock, but to commence debate at 11 o'clock.

I think that would be better settled afterwards, and the question of a night session settled on Thursday night. I ask that the gentleman modify his request so as to make it in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, subject to conference reports and appropriation bills.

Mr. STANLEY. I have no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not agree to that myself, Mr. Speaker, because I am perfectly willing and glad for the gentleman to have opportunity for debate. Of course, this report has gone to the calendar. There is nothing in the proposition but to have general debate, and I think it very proper that the gentleman from Kentucky and his colleagues have opportunity to discuss this matter before the committee, but if you go into committee you can not bring up these other bills if you desire to do so.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I think unless there is some time agreed upon as to the seamen's bill, I shall have to object.

Mr. STANLEY. You do not object to this, do you?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, I withdraw the objection.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. If this House can find time to discuss the reports on the steel investigation, losing many hours without final action on those reports, I think that time should be given to the consideration of one of the most important measures that has been pending in this Congress, and that is upon the Dillingham or Burnett bill, looking to the restriction of undesirable foreign immigration. Why waste the valuable time of this House in its closing hours in a useless discussion which does not mean action on the part of the House—

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOWMAN]?

Mr. AUSTIN. In a moment. And deny a day in the House for the consideration of the most important legislation to the American people that is now pending before Congress, namely, for the restriction of undesirable foreign immigration? And, unless there is some understanding in reference to a hearing and consideration of that legislation, I shall object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman yield to me for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does not the gentleman think he should welcome a discussion of this steel report that will clear up some matters connected with the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., in which the people of his State may be interested?

Mr. AUSTIN. The people of this country are more vitally interested in the subject I have mentioned than they are in a lot of speeches on the subject of the steel investigation, which will be made without any action by Congress on the steel reports.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman, by indulging in rather extreme language, is endeavoring to avoid the exposition of a lot of valuable information that may not be pleasing to the gentleman's party at this particular time.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not object to a thorough investigation and airing of every Republican national administration, but every Member of this House knows the appeal that is being made daily for legislation along the lines I have suggested; and unless those in control of legislation give us a promise and an assurance of action on one of these two bills I have named, I shall object to the waste of time in this House for mere discussion.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee request the gentlemen on the other side to fix a day when we can consider the Dillingham bill or the Burnett bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I insist upon a day being named for the consideration of the legislation I have named.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BOWMAN. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have received several hundred letters regarding this immigration question from the people in my district. Those letters have been referred to the House with the request that they should be referred to the committee having charge of this legislation. I have received this morning several letters, and this question should surely be considered by this House and some conclusion arrived at. I fully agree with the opinion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] that this is an extremely necessary piece of legislation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman which side he is on. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOWMAN. I will state that when we come to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BURNETT. This is a good time to express yourselves.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has the floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. I object until we can have an understanding.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then I demand the regular order. The gentleman can not have an understanding.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] demands the regular order.

TARIFF DUTIES ON WOOL.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up a conference report on the wool bill (H. R. 22195), and ask that the Clerk report it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois if he will not withhold his point of order. There may be some little discussion on the conference report, and I am not going to try to force a roll call on the gentleman in the absence of a sufficient number of Members here. Possibly when we get into the discussion we shall have a quorum here.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to submit a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The House having set apart, by special order, one hour for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] to address the House immediately after the reading of the Journal, is it in order to call up any other matter?

The SPEAKER. Well, if it were at the beginning of the session, instead of toward the end of it—

Mr. NORRIS. This is not "toward the end of it"—

The SPEAKER (continuing). The Chair would be very much disposed to rule that where an agreement of that kind had been entered into it took precedence over conference reports and everything else. But the business of the House must be wound up some way or other.

Mr. MANN. Was it not for the House, Mr. Speaker, to consider that when it made the order?

The SPEAKER. When the House makes these special orders—if the Chair may be permitted to state the case according to his ideas—it makes them without any consideration whatever.

Mr. MANN. I do not think the House made this order in that way.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The special order obtained by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] was passed over, as was stated in the House, until after the conference report on the wool bill should be disposed of. I understand that if we get the wool bill over to the Senate to-day it will probably be disposed of there and thus expedite adjournment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will rule that under the agreement that was made here half an hour ago—

Mr. MANN. If the Chair will pardon me, there was no agreement made.

The SPEAKER. If it was not an agreement, what was it?

Mr. MANN. The gentlemen proposed an agreement, but I expressly stated that I would not make any agreement.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite the business of the House, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on the wool bill be submitted and considered before proceeding with my remarks.

Mr. MANN. It is perfectly patent that the wool bill could not be voted upon for some time, because Members of the House understood yesterday that the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] would make his speech this morning. I notice a considerable attendance on the Democratic side of the House and some lack of attendance on the Republican side of the House, denoting the varying degrees of interest that the two sides of the House have in the speech. I suggest that if the gentleman from Texas will go on and make his speech gentlemen on both sides will come in in time for the wool report. But no one now would want to have a roll call on the wool bill without time being allowed for gentlemen to get here. I think it shortens it for the gentleman from Texas to address the House first, and he will hold everybody who comes and attract others to come. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Now, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] does not seem to care particularly as to the time at which he speaks, and there was some kind of a loose agreement here 30 minutes ago to the effect that certain things should be

attended to. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has the right of way.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Illinois make his point of order when we come to a vote on the bill. The House has about as many Members present now as is usual, and it will be after 12 o'clock when the vote will come.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman intend to consume time on the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not expect to consume any great length of time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about it. The report came in late last evening. The gentleman from Alabama asked that the session commence this morning at 11 o'clock, and did so at a time when nearly everybody had left the Chamber. One or two gentlemen have spoken to me about debate on this bill. I do not know whether they want to talk or not. They are not here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Clerk to report the conference report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is taking advantage of the House to have the House meet at 11 o'clock, with the understanding that one gentleman is to occupy an hour, and to then call up another matter in the House, and therefore I insist on the point of order of no quorum.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it was stated in the RECORD last night that either the wool bill or the conference report on the legislative bill would be considered at 11 o'clock to-day. That was the reason I asked the House to meet at that time.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; it was stated that the gentleman from Texas would occupy one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following gentlemen failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Dies	Jacoway	Pray
Aiken, S. C.	Difenderfer	Jones	Pujo
Allen	Dixon, Ind.	Kindred	Randell, Tex.
Ames	Dodds	Kinkead, N. J.	Rauch
Anderson, Ohio	Donohoe	Knowland	Redfield
Andrus	Doughton	Konig	Reyburn
Anthony	Dupré	Konop	Richardson
Barchfield	Dwight	Kopp	Riordan
Barnhart	Dyer	Lafan	Roberts, Nev.
Bartholdt	Edwards	Lamb	Roddenberry
Bartlett	Ellerbe	Langham	Rodenberg
Bathrick	Esch	Langley	Rouse
Bell, Ga.	Fairchild	Lawrence	Rucker, Mo.
Berger	Farr	Legare	Scully
Boehne	Ferris	Levy	Shackelford
Booher	Fields	Lewis	Sharp
Borland	Focht	Lindsay	Sheppard
Bradley	Fordney	Linthicum	Sherry
Browning	Fornes	Littleton	Sherwood
Burke, Pa.	Gallagher	Loud	Slemp
Burke, S. D.	Gardner, Mass.	McCall	Smith, J. M. C.
Byrnes, S. C.	Gardner, N. J.	McCreary	Smith, Cal.
Calder	Garner	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, N. Y.
Callaway	Garrett	McHenry	Speer
Campbell	Glass	McKenzie	Stack
Cantrill	Gould	McKinley	Stack
Carlin	Gray	Macon	Stephens, Miss.
Carter	Gregg, Tex.	Madden	Stephens, Tex.
Cary	Griest	Maher	Sulzer
Clarke, Fla.	Guernsey	Martin, S. Dak.	Talbot, Md.
Cline	Hamilton, Mich.	Matthews	Taylor, Ala.
Collier	Hamilton, W. Va.	Mays	Taylor, Colo.
Cooper	Hanna	Moon, Pa.	Taylor, Ohio
Copley	Hardwick	Moon, Tenn.	Thayer
Covington	Harris	Moore, Pa.	Thistlewood
Cox, Ind.	Hartman	Moore, Tex.	Thomas
Cox, Ohio	Hayes	Morgan	Turnbull
Cullop	Heald	Morrison	Tuttle
Curley	Helm	Moss, Ind.	Utter
Currier	Henry, Conn.	Murdock	Vare
Curry	Higgins	Nelson	Vreeland
Dalzell	Hill	Nye	Weeks
Daugherty	Hinds	Olmsted	Whitacre
Davenport	Hobson	Palmer	Wilder
Davidson	Howard	Parran	Wilson, N. Y.
De Forest	Hughes, Ga.	Patten, N. Y.	Young, Mich.
Dickson, Miss.	Jackson	Powers	Young, Tex.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he answered "Present."

The SPEAKER. The roll call shows 204 Members present, a quorum.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to; and the Doorkeeper was directed to open the doors.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the statement in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the statement instead of the conference report on the wool bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1130).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 22195) to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"That the act approved August 5, 1900, entitled 'An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes,' is hereby amended by striking out all of Schedule K thereof, being paragraphs 360 to 395, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SCHEDULE K. WOOL AND MANUFACTURES THEREOF.

"360. On wool of the sheep, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and on all wools and hair on the skin of such animals, the duty shall be 29 per cent ad valorem.

"361. On all noils, top waste, card waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, ring waste, yarn waste, bur waste, thread waste, garnetted waste, shoddies, mungo, flocks, wool extract, carbonized wool, carbonized noils, and on all other wastes and on woolen rags composed wholly of wool, or of which wool is the component material of chief value, and not specially provided for in this section, the duty shall be 29 per cent ad valorem.

"362. On combed wool or tops and roving or roping, made wholly of wool or camel's hair, or of which wool or camel's hair is the component material of chief value, and all wools and hair which have been advanced in any manner or by any process of manufacture beyond the washed or scoured condition, not specially provided for in this section, the duty shall be 32 per cent ad valorem.

"363. On yarns made wholly of wool, or of which wool is the component material of chief value, the duty shall be 35 per cent ad valorem.

"364. On cloths, knit fabrics, flannels not for underwear, composed wholly of wool or of which wool is the component material of chief value, women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting, and goods of similar description and character, clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, including shawls, whether knitted or woven, and knitted articles of every description made up or manufactured wholly or in part, felts not woven, and not specially provided for in this section, webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, bandings, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, edgings, insertings, flouncings, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, ribbons, ornaments, laces, trimmings, and articles made wholly or in part of lace, embroideries and all articles embroidered by hand or machinery, head nets, nettings, buttons or barrel buttons or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, and manufactures of wool ornamented with beads or spangles of whatever material composed, on any of the foregoing composed wholly of wool or of which wool is the component material of chief value, and on all manufactures of every description made by any process of wool or of which wool is the component material of chief value, whether containing india rubber or not, not specially provided for in this section, the duty shall be 49 per cent ad valorem.

"365. On all blankets, and flannels for underwear, composed wholly of wool, or of which wool is the component material of chief value, the duty shall be 38 per cent ad valorem.

"366. On Aubusson, Axminster, moquette, and chenille carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description; on Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description; and on carpets of every description, woven whole for rooms, and Oriental, Berlin, Aubusson, Axminster, and similar rugs, the duty shall be 50 per cent ad valorem.

"367. On Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description; and on velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, figured or plain, printed on the warp or otherwise, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, the duty shall be 40 per cent ad valorem.

"368. On tapestry Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, printed on

the warp or otherwise; on treble ingrain, three-ply, and all-chain Venetian carpets; on wool Dutch and two-ply ingrain carpets; on druggets and bookings, printed, colored, or otherwise; and on carpets and carpeting of wool or of which wool is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"369. Mats, rugs for floors, screens, covers, hassocks, bed-sides, art squares, and other portions of carpets or carpeting made wholly of wool or of which wool is the component material of chief value, and not specially provided for in this section, shall be subjected to the rate of duty herein imposed on carpets or carpeting of like character or description.

"370. On all manufactures of hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other like animal, or of which any of the hair mentioned in paragraph 369 form the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, the duty shall be 49 per cent ad valorem.

"371. Whenever in this act the word "wool" is used in connection with a manufactured article of which it is a component material, it shall be held to include wool or hair of the sheep, camel, goat, alpaca, or other like animals, whether manufactured by the woolen, worsted, felt, or any other process."

"SEC. 2. That on and after the day when this act shall go into effect all goods, wares, and merchandise previously imported and hereinbefore enumerated, described, and provided for, for which no entry has been made, and all such goods, wares, and merchandise previously entered without payment of duty and under bond for warehousing, transportation, or any other purpose, for which no permit of delivery to the importer or his agent has been issued, shall be subjected to no other duty upon the entry or withdrawal thereof than the duty which would be imposed if such goods, wares, or merchandise were imported on or after that date.

"SEC. 3. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed. This act shall take effect and be in force on and after the 1st day of January, 1913."

And the Senate agree to the same.

O. W. UNDERWOOD,

D. W. SHACKLEFORD,

Managers on the part of the House.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,

J. W. BAILEY,

F. M. SIMMONS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 22195) to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool, submit the following written statement in explanation of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report:

The agreement reached by the conference committee is in the form of a substitute for the House bill and the amendment of the Senate, and is set forth in extenso in the accompanying conference report.

In brief, the salient points of agreement recommended as to the differences between the two Houses on the rates of duty on wool and manufactures thereof are as follows:

The rate of duty recommended on raw wool is 29 per cent ad valorem, instead of 20 per cent ad valorem as proposed in the House bill, and the varying rates, ranging from 10 to 35 per cent ad valorem, on the three classifications of wool proposed by the Senate.

The rate on wool wastes and rags agreed upon is 29 per cent ad valorem, instead of 20 per cent ad valorem as proposed in the House bill and the rates of 25 or 30 per cent ad valorem as proposed in the Senate amendment.

The duty on combed wool or tops agreed upon is 32 per cent ad valorem, instead of 25 per cent ad valorem as proposed in the House bill and 40 per cent ad valorem as proposed by the Senate.

The duty agreed upon for yarns is 35 per cent ad valorem, instead of 30 per cent ad valorem as proposed in the House bill and 45 per cent ad valorem as proposed in the Senate amendment.

The rate of duty on blankets and flannels for underwear is fixed at 38 per cent ad valorem, instead of 30 per cent ad valorem in the House bill for blankets and the cheaper flannels.

The duty agreed upon for cloths, ready-made clothing, knit fabrics, flannels not for underwear, women's dress goods, web-bings, gorings, etc., and articles not specially provided for, is 49 per cent ad valorem, instead of the varying rates in the

House bill, ranging from 35 to 50 per cent ad valorem, and 55 per cent ad valorem as proposed by the Senate.

Three classifications were agreed upon for carpets, ranging in duty from 30 to 50 per cent ad valorem instead of the varying classifications in the House bill carrying duties from 25 to 50 per cent ad valorem, and 35 per cent ad valorem as proposed by the Senate amendment.

The date when the act shall take effect is made January 1, 1913.

O. W. UNDERWOOD,

D. W. SHACKLEFORD,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the statement that has just been read at the Clerk's desk indicates to the House the difference and the change of rates between the present law and the House bill and the conference report that has been agreed upon by the conferees of the two Houses. A comparison of the rates of duties on imports with the last year on the wool bill shows that the imports on raw wool under the Payne law for the year 1911 amounted to \$29,572,000. The amount of estimated imports was \$66,000,000 under the House bill. The estimated amount of imports under the conference bill is \$60,000,000. With these imports it would show a duty on raw wool raised by the House bill of \$13,389,000 and by the conference bill \$17,400,000, as against \$12,482,000 raised by the present law last year.

The reduction in the rate of duty on raw wool is shown by a comparison of the rate of duty of last year under the Payne bill and the House bill and the conference report to be as follows: Last year the average rate of duty on raw wool was 42.21 per cent of all raw wool imported. The House bill provided a rate of duty of 20 per cent, and the conference report bill provides a rate of duty of 29 per cent. In other words, there will be a reduction of something over 13 per cent ad valorem on raw wool if this bill becomes a law.

Now, in the manufactures of wool last year the total importation under the present law was \$18,823,000. The estimated importation under the House bill was \$63,000,000. The estimated importation under the conference bill would be \$51,000,000.

Under that basis of importation the revenue under the Payne bill last year amounted actually on manufactures of wool to \$16,499,000. The estimated revenue under the House bill would have been \$27,000,000 and under the conference bill \$25,000,000.

The average tax levied by the Payne bill, the present law, on manufactures of wool last year amounted to 87.65 per cent. The estimated tax on manufactures of wool, as provided by the House bill, is 42.55 per cent, and under the conference bill now presented to the House amounted to 48.36 per cent.

So that if this bill becomes a law the reduction of rates on manufactures of wool will be the difference between 87.65 per cent and 48.36 per cent, or 37.5 per cent. The year before that the average rate of duty under the Payne bill was 90 per cent.

Now, assembling the entire woolen schedule, including raw wool and manufactures of wool, the imports under the Payne bill last year were \$48,395,000. The estimated amount of imports under the House bill was \$130,000,000, and the estimated imports under the conference report bill is \$111,890,000. The revenue derived from Schedule K last year amounted to \$28,982,000, as compared with \$41,904,000 for the year 1910, or a falling off in this schedule of about \$30,000,000 last year over the year before. The estimated duty that would be raised by the House bill is about \$40,000,000. The estimated revenue that would be raised by the conference bill is \$42,000,000. The total ad valorem tax levied by the present law for the year 1911 amounted to 59.89 per cent. The estimated ad valorem rate under the House bill would be 31 per cent ad valorem, and under the conference report 37.98 per cent. In other words, the average ad valorem rate of the House bill was about 7 per cent ad valorem less than the rate proposed in the conference report.

The conference report itself is nearly 22 per cent less than the average rate by the present law.

Now, I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that if this bill becomes a law it will raise as much, if not more, revenue, and probably considerably more revenue than is raised by the present law, and yet at the same time there will be a reduction on the entire schedule of something like 22 per cent.

But as the consumer pays the tax on the manufactured product and not on the raw product the real relief to the people would be shown in the difference between the average rate on manufactured wool under the present law of 87.65 and 48.36, the estimated rate under the conference report, or a reduction to the consumer of nearly 40 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear that if we can pass a bill that will not reduce the revenue and at the same time make a reduction to the con-

sumers of the United States of 40 per cent of the taxes that they pay on the manufactured wool, that we are accomplishing a great result for the American people. More than that, this bill itself leaves an average ad valorem rate of 48 per cent on manufactured wool. I think it is but just, though, to state that the manufacturer, having to pay the duty on the raw wool, that that should be taken into consideration when you estimate incidental protection that would grow out of a bill of this kind, and as we estimate it that when you carry the raw wool ad valorem rate into the finished product the amount that you have got to estimate to take care of the manufacturer for what he has to pay for the raw wool is about one-half the rate levied on raw wool when you are estimating in ad valorem rates, and the reason of that is that the value has increased and therefore the estimate of the ad valorem rate grows higher, and as under this bill the ad valorem rate is 29 per cent on raw wool, 15 per cent would amount to a compensatory rate to the manufacturer, and deducting 15 per cent from the 48 per cent in this bill that the manufacturer has as an incidental protection leaves an average of 33 per cent incidental protection to the manufacturer. When you consider that for years the great iron and steel industry only had about 33 per cent protection even under a Republican bill and was reduced by the Payne tariff law, it will be greatly reduced by the law that we sent to the Senate the other day, it seems to me clear that the manufacturers of this country, having an incidental protection under this bill of something over 33 per cent, have no right to complain that they will be injured, much less destroyed, by the passage of this bill.

I believe the bill is just to the manufacturer. I believe it is fair and reasonable. I believe it is demanded in the interest of the American people. I believe that this Congress should enact it into law at once. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And now that the President has had a report from the Tariff Board, I think that the American people have a right to demand of him when the Congress of the United States, which is charged with the responsibility of legislation, once more returns its bill to him for his signature. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask how much time I have consumed?

The SPEAKER. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to yield—

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is this bill exactly the same as the bill adopted by the conference report?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is a clerical change in one line of two words that are added in one line, but outside of that—

Mr. LONGWORTH. What is that?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is no change in rates. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has the interlineation there.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I desire to ask the gentleman one more question. He has been speaking about the rates on manufactured wool, and I want to ask him this question: Does the gentleman believe that the rate of 29 per cent on raw wool is a protective rate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I will say candidly to the gentleman from Ohio that it is very much higher, I think, than necessary for revenue purposes and that as an independent proposition I would not have agreed to it. I agreed to it as a matter of compromise in order that we may get a bill to the President.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But is it, in the gentleman's judgment, a protective rate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, if we look at it from the standpoint of protection, I do not believe that the sheep industry of this country needs any rate for protection whatever. If any rate, looking at it from a protective standpoint, would be a protective rate, the only thing to justify the levying of a tax on raw wool, in my judgment, as shown by the Tariff Board report and by my own opinion on the subject, is to levy a tax for revenue and revenue alone.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then it is, in the gentleman's opinion, a protective rate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think any—

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is largely in excess of the revenue rate, is it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think that there is any rate levied on raw wool justified from the standpoint of protection as the gentleman looks at the standpoint of protection. In other words, as I take it, the position of the gentleman from Ohio on protection is that a rate should be levied that will equal the difference of cost at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to the producer. As I understand, that is his position. Now, I say to the gentleman, from my investigation I do not believe that there is any real difference in the cost in this country and abroad on the raising of raw wool,

except in merino sheep in Ohio, and there is only 5,000,000 sheep in that herd, and that on all other sheep in the United States, as shown by the Tariff Board's report, there is no difference in the cost of production. I do not think we ought to levy a tax merely to protect one herd of sheep when the sheep raisers of Ohio, as far as cross-bred sheep are concerned, have shown that they can be raised without protection and a living made out of them. There is no justification in merely levying a tax to protect merino sheep when the sheep industry can survive without it, and I think the gentleman himself will agree with me that the report of the Tariff Board shows that there is no difference in cost on other flocks of sheep. Therefore, if that is the case, there is no difference in cost on anything except the merino sheep in Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not agree with the gentleman at all. I think it is shown to the contrary conclusively, but I will not go into that now. Let me ask the gentleman another question. Does he believe the passage of this bill will reduce the price of raw wool?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I do not know that it will. I think that it will bring about the importation of a larger amount of raw wool. As a matter of fact, last year territorial wool in this country was selling for less than imported wool after you removed the tax. And, therefore, I am not prepared to say that it will reduce the price of raw wool, but I do say most emphatically that if you pass this bill it will reduce the price of a great many articles to the benefit of the American people.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The reason I asked the question is that I want to be perfectly clear as to the gentleman's position. It is this: That the passage of this bill would reduce manufactured wool 40 per cent but would not reduce the price of raw wool at all?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I stated to the gentleman, on last year's statement territorial wools last year vary. It might reduce it as to some years, but last year territorial wool was sold cheaper in this country than imported wool with the tariff taken off. And I can not say, under those circumstances, as compared to last year it would reduce the price. It may do this: It may prevent an exorbitant price being asked in the future, but it will undoubtedly reduce the taxes on a great many articles where the present tariff is prohibitive.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am not speaking of manufactured wool at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Let me ask the gentleman one more question as to his position. If it were not for the necessities of revenue, to which he has alluded, would he favor putting wool on the free list?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If it was not for the purpose of revenue, I would not lay a tax on anything. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] how much time he desires me to yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not want any more time than the gentleman has already consumed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I consumed?

The SPEAKER. Twenty minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I yield to the gentleman from New York 20 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] wants five minutes. That is the only request I have for time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will take pleasure in yielding the gentleman from Wyoming five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized for 5 minutes, and then the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is to be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama referred to the merino sheep of Ohio as a "herd," which, of course, illustrates how much the gentleman knows about the sheep business. The man who refers to a flock of sheep as a "herd" can not be very well informed on the fundamental propositions connected with the wool industry.

Coming from a State that has nearly a tenth of all the sheep in the Union, and a larger proportion of the sheep of merino blood, I should be very glad indeed if it were possible to settle the question of the wool tariff at this time. And the flock masters whom I represent would be willing to accept any measure which would make it possible, or under which it would be possible, for them to continue in business with a reasonable assurance of a fair profit.

But this bill is objectionable not only to them, but to all who believe in American industries, including both the raising of sheep and the manufacture of wool. First, the bill is not

carefully or wisely drawn. It is not scientific in its schedules. While some of its rates may be high enough, others are altogether too low; and if the average were a correct one, it is not a well-balanced bill, and would be destructive to certain very important lines of industry.

As to the rate on raw wool, not only is the ad valorem itself too low, as shown by the report of the Tariff Board, which, contrary to the views expressed by my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], shows that the average of American wool needs a protection amounting to about 35 or 36 per cent ad valorem; but, further, no ad valorem rate can properly protect the wool industry; no ad valorem rate on wool can properly protect the American Treasury. Wool is brought from the ends of the earth. It passes through oftentimes half a dozen hands before it finally reaches the customhouse. It is practically impossible for the customs officials adequately and properly and fairly to adjust and levy an ad valorem rate. The result would be inevitably undervaluations, cheating, and fraud. All honest importers would be driven out of the business, and the Treasury would be robbed at one end and the American sheep raisers would be put out of business at the other end.

Not only would the merino-wool industry in this country suffer—and nearly nine-tenths of our sheep have some merino blood in them—not only would the merino-wool industry suffer under this bill, if it were not largely destroyed, but no part of the wool industry could be prosperous under the rate proposed in the manner in which it is proposed as an ad valorem rate, because it can not be administered in a way to afford protection either to the grower of the wool or to the Treasury.

And therefore, though I should be glad to vote for a rate even somewhat lower than the rate which the report of the Tariff Board indicates would be surely protective, if that could settle the question, I can not in justice to the American industries manufacturing wool or in justice to the people who are growing wool on the farms and ranches, support this measure, which would be destructive of all these industries. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, this is substantially the same wool bill that was sent to the President before, and which encountered his veto—not simply because of the report of the Tariff Board, because we did not have it at that time, but also because of the information then at hand that showed it was not a protective measure.

Since that time we have had the report of the Tariff Board, and the mind of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is in the same state of confusion on this subject as it was in then. He was then for a revenue duty of 20 per cent, because the Treasury needed it, although at heart he was for free wool. Then, we had the Senate action upon the question, with the same old duty of 35 per cent on wool as now. The majority behind this bill in the Senate seems to have learned nothing from the Tariff Board's report. Then they go into conference, and it is not 20 per cent or 35 per cent as the result, but 29 per cent, and I suppose that all three rates are according to the opinion of all these gentlemen, in accordance with the findings of the Tariff Board.

Now, no intelligent gentleman can read carefully and study the report of the Tariff Board without coming to the conclusion that the necessary lowest protection on wool needed is over 35 per cent. With an ad valorem it ought to be more, because of the undervaluations and the cheating of the duty. They do not seem to have considered at all the recommendations of this board for a specific duty on the scoured content of the wool, which all experts agree is the only scientific way of levying a duty upon wool, instead of resorting to the 29 per cent ad valorem duty; and now the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], toward the close of his remarks, is trying to persuade himself that he is protecting the wool and woolen industry.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken. I never assumed to protect anybody. I simply stated what the incidental protection was.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman says that the duty he provides—29 per cent on wool—is more protection than the wool needs; that it does not need any. If that is not protecting the wool industry, according to that statement, I would like to know what the word "protection" means.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York how he can levy any duties without incidental protection.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, if you put the duty below the difference in cost, it is not protection. Now, in reference to manufactures, he figured that there was a duty of 33 per cent over and above the compensation for the wool duty, and he said that that was more than the difference in cost, and hence was a protection to the wool manufacturing industry. Why is the gentleman making that argument? What is the meaning of this whole performance from beginning to end? Does any gentleman who is for this bill honestly desire that the duties be lowered by legislation, or are we simply still playing politics in sending a bill to the President which we feel sure the President will not sign? Is there some more of this "putting the President in a hole" which did not succeed in the first attempt, and which will not succeed now any better than it did the first time? [Applause on the Republican side.] Because now we have the report of the Tariff Board, which shows that there should be a duty of more than 35 per cent to make up the difference in the cost of the wool generally entering into the market, generally raised both here and in competing countries, the bulk of it.

Now, after allowing proper compensation for the duty on wool, the value of the wool being about 65 per cent of the cloth, as is calculated by experts, it leaves a margin of less than 30 per cent duty on woolen cloths for the protection of the conversion of the wool into cloth, knit goods, flannels, and all manufactures of cloth in this country over and above the cost in foreign countries. The duty was 40 to 50 per cent in the Wilson bill, because then we had free wool. It was 40 per cent on cloths costing not over 50 cents a pound and 50 per cent on the higher-priced cloth. But what happened under the Wilson bill? I do not care anything about the theories of the gentleman or the theories of any other gentleman. Did or did not nearly every woolen mill and knitting mill in the country close under the Wilson bill? Did or did not the slaughter of the sheep commence and continue during the life of the Wilson bill, and did it stop only when we had the Dingley bill enacted? If there was sufficient protection, why the slaughter of the sheep? If there was sufficient protection on manufactures, why the closing of the mills?

They impudently send this bill to the President, and tell him what? Why, that it is all the protection that is needed under this report of the Tariff Board, when he knows, and the Tariff Board knows, and experts know that it is not protection either to the wool industry or to the manufacturing business. If this is sufficient protection, why does the gentleman calculate that instead of \$48,000,000 of imports under the woolen schedule there will be \$111,000,000? I think those were his figures as I caught them. Why this increase in imports if there is to be protection under this bill?

And then the gentleman draws on his fancy again, and his interest is for the dear consumer, and he will not stop playing politics even for six months, his interest in the dear consumer is so great; and he says it is not only on the goods that are imported but it is on the goods made here that the consumer has to pay these duties under the present law, which duties we acknowledge are greater than they should be. Yet if there is anything more clearly demonstrated than another in the Tariff Board report, it is that this duty is not added to the price, that the competition on domestic cloths is so great in manufacturing that they are sold in the market at a price much below the cost of imported articles of the same kind with the duty added. The consumer is not paying the duty in that respect. It is one of the things that is so clearly demonstrated in this Tariff Board report that the wayfaring man, though a Representative in Congress, need not err therein.

Now, why do you send this to the President? Do you gentlemen expect he is going to sign it? Not a mother's son of you expects anything of the kind. You know the bill does not give the protection which the report of the Tariff Board shows to be absolutely necessary to make up the difference in cost between this country and the cost abroad. You know that it does not make up that difference. You know that the President of the United States believes, not in overprotection, not in excessive protection, but in protection that makes up the difference in cost. Do you expect him to stultify himself?

Why, gentlemen, you can not keep up this masquerade. You can not fool the people into the idea that no matter how you cut down tariff duties, and cut out an industry by cutting down the duties, you are doing what they want. The majority of the people of this country believe in protection to American industries under tariff laws. The majority of them do not believe in excessive protection, but they believe in that protection which makes up the difference between the cost here and abroad, and you may go on sending your bills to the President, as though you had learned nothing from that wonderful work of the Tariff

Board. You call them compromise measures. Compromise for what purpose? To get something to the President that you believe he will veto. Why do you not take a bill that comes up to the requirements of the report of the Tariff Board? Why do you not take the minority House bill, if you please, and criticize it, and if you can find any flaws in it, correct them, and send that bill to the President, and see whether he will sign or veto it?

I want to say to you gentlemen, if you sent that bill to the President, there would not be any doubt about a radical reduction on the wool schedule during this session of Congress.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman's point of view, of course, is different from that of gentlemen on this side of the House; but the minority to-day on that side of the House were the majority in the last Congress, and the bill that the present minority and the then majority passed was vetoed by the American people. We prefer a veto at the White House rather than a veto by the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, there is not a man within the sound of my voice that does not know that we labored to make a better bill than the present law, and still the present law is a better law than has been written on the statute books of this country within the last 50 years with reference to the tariff. [Applause on the Republican side.] I did not get all that I wanted; I was not able to revise this woolen schedule; the time was too short, the information was not sufficient. If we had had the report of the Tariff Board back of us the woolen schedule would have been revised, and in accordance with the ideas of some of the wise politicians who sit on the other side of this Chamber, such a revision of that schedule at that time in connection with the present tariff law would have given us a majority on this side of the Chamber in 1910 instead of a majority on that side.

O gentlemen, do something besides shed crocodile tears for the consumers of this country. Do something besides playing politics. You pretend to be enthusiastically triumphant now about the next election. Why in the world are you all the time neglecting the dear people, with whom you sympathize on these wool duties, to play petty politics, to put the President, nominated for reelection, in a hole, as you say? Why do you not pass that bill which the minority presented, which is a radical reduction in these rates, and still so adjusted as to cover the difference between the cost here and the cost abroad, and send that to the President, and see whether he will sign or veto that bill? If he signs it, it will give the people the relief which you say you are so anxious to give them. Gentlemen, why not revise the woolen schedule so that it will become a law and not revise it simply for election day? Possibly there may be a little boomerang about this joker of yours that you are trying to play for the second time. It did not amount to much when you tried it first, and it will amount to less now.

I am for the relief of these dear people you talk about so much, and I would like to pass the minority bill in this House, which would not only give the people relief but enable the farmers in the Western States to keep on raising sheep. It would enable our mills to run and the prosperity under the present law to be continued. True, if you do not amend the present law, that law is doing well by the people; it is not closing the mills; it is not making farming unprofitable; it does not include free trade on all farm products raised in the North, free trade on all farm products except rice. The farmers are doing well. The factories are doing well. People are at work, and men are agonizing to get people to work in the fields and in certain localities to get people to work in the factories. Perhaps you are doing the best thing to let well enough alone when it is so much better than anything you propose by any of the bills you have brought in here. Keep on playing to the galleries, and by and by, not in the dim and distant future, but in the near by and by, the galleries will be looking down on a majority in this House who are the true friends and not the false friends, like yourselves, of the people of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I will take advantage of the leave given me to print to add to the foregoing remarks. After they had been delivered it was stated in the House that the average rate of duties under the Wilson law was 40 per cent ad valorem, which, it was stated, is higher than the bill which I offer as a substitute. Of course the latter is nothing but a guess, as you can not get a correct average under any bill except by actual results, and the bill has not yet become a law.

Aside from all this, conditions have changed in the last 18 years, and on both sides of the Atlantic they use more effective machinery and employ more efficient operatives, and the difference in cost of production is less, generally, now than it was 18 years ago.

The bill I offer is based upon a careful study of the Tariff Board report, and I confidently believe is as nearly correct as it can be made. Like the present law, if this bill is enacted it will close no mill and injure no farm. That mills were closed and sheep by the millions were slaughtered under the Wilson law is a matter of history; that the slaughter was stopped and the mills were opened was a result of the Dingley law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, at the special session last year I voted for this conference bill. I propose to vote for it again to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I shall do so, Mr. Speaker, with less hesitation than I did then, for since then we have the report of the Tariff Board. I want to frankly say that I wish the rates in this bill were somewhat higher. I believe that as to some of them they ought to be higher to be clearly beyond the danger point; but, Mr. Speaker, as between the present schedule, the present outrageous schedule of the Payne-Aldrich law and this schedule, I prefer this one. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

So far as raw wool is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is demonstrated now that the purported protection of the woolgrower in the Payne-Aldrich bill is a fraud upon him, that he does not in fact get more than 50 per cent of the purported protection afforded by that bill. The fact is that this 29 per cent given in this bill, while I would like to see it higher, is actually more than the great majority of the woolgrowers have been getting during the past two years under the Payne-Aldrich law. Now, so far as the manufactures of wool are concerned, so far as the interest of the manufacturer is concerned, it may be that some of the rates in this bill are such that his profits are not going to be so great as what, under ordinary circumstances, would be reasonable.

But, Mr. Speaker, if that be so, it is his own fault, for previous tariff bills have been written by him and for him enabling him to secure exorbitant profits at the expense of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, let me say further, the Committee on Rules during this session of Congress had an investigation of the Lawrence strike. We made a very thorough investigation of the wages paid in some of the great woolen mills of the country, and found the wages paid in those woolen mills, the highest protected industry in the United States to-day, were such as ought not to exist anywhere in this great American Republic of ours, and if those wages can not be increased, then, I say, we would better get along without woolen mills in this country. I believe in American standards of living, and I believe in a reasonable wage to American laboring people, and if we can not, without taxing the American people millions of dollars a year, do that in our woolen mills, then we had better let those people stay across the water and make the things there and get them cheaper here.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is not so. They can and ought to pay higher wages. The trouble has been that these woolen manufacturers have been getting exorbitant profits and not passing on the protective duties to the laborers. They must be made to understand that if they are to get protection at the hands of the American people, which the Republican Party has always afforded, in order that they shall be able to pay American wages to American laboring men, then they must pass the benefits on to the laboring man.

My friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has said that this bill is not carefully drawn; that it is not scientifically drawn, but, Mr. Speaker, the present schedule of the Payne-Aldrich law was too carefully drawn in the interest of the woolen manufacturer. [Applause on the Democratic side.] While this bill may not be and is not as scientifically drawn as I would like to see it, I prefer this bill to the present law, for it does afford protection to a reasonable degree to the American manufacturer and the American woolgrower, and at the same time does afford relief to the people who use woolen goods. I prefer that rather than to maintain the present schedule of the present Payne law, which the President himself has pronounced as indefensible. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in his statement about the bill made a very remarkable statement. He said that the rates under the Wilson bill ruined the country. The rates under the Wilson bill were 40 per cent ad valorem. The gentleman now proposes to save the country by advocating the passage of a bill in which he says

the average rate is only 35 per cent. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this debate, I desire to have read from the Clerk's desk a statement of the amount of rates of duty charged under the woolen schedule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Table showing rates collected under the Payne law for the year ending June 30, 1911 (the last full report), as shown by the Bureau of Statistics.

	Per cent.
Class 1 wool, unwashed	43 to 46
Class 1 wool, washed	60 to 97
Class 2 wool	49 to 120
Class 3 wool	30 to 105
Wool and hair advanced	74 to 178
Yarns	76 to 149
Blankets	55 to 168
Carpets	50 to 72
Cloths	63 to 149
Women and children's dress goods	94 to 157
Flannels	71 to 121
Knit fabrics	95 to 153
Plushes	99 to 122
Wearing apparel	65 to 92
All other manufactures of wool	61 to 157

In this table are given the minimum and maximum ad valorem rates for the year 1911 as reported in the volume named.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Tariff Board did not think it was necessary to advise the House in its report in reference to blankets and flannels, and I will ask to have read from the desk a statement of the taxes levied on blankets and flannels under the present law.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rates taken from "Imported merchandise entered for consumption in the United States and duties collected thereon for 1911," issued by the Bureau of Statistics.

Blankets costing 47 cents a pound paid 105 per cent; blankets more than 3 yards in length, costing 28 cents a pound, paid 168.54 per cent; valued at 59 cents a pound, 124.94 per cent; valued at 93 cents a pound, 102.54 per cent. Cloth valued at 33 cents a pound paid 149.59 per cent; valued at 60 cents a pound, paid 123.71 per cent; valued at \$1.12 a pound, 94.17 per cent; valued at \$1.77 a pound, 63.92 per cent; the dearer the cloth the less the rate. Women's and children's dress goods, weighing 4 ounces or less to square yard, costing from 13 cents to 14 cents per square yard, 103 per cent; weighing more than 4 ounces to square yard, costing 38 cents per square yard, 130.68 per cent; costing 61 cents a yard, 116.07 per cent; composed wholly or in part of wool, costing 31 cents a yard, 157.69 per cent; costing 58 cents a yard, 125.82 per cent.

Flannels costing 46 cents per pound, 108 per cent; weighing over 4 ounces to square yard, costing 61 cents per pound, 121.93 per cent; costing 85 cents per pound, 107.08 per cent; knit fabrics costing 32 cents per pound, 153.19 per cent; costing 64 cents per pound, 118.62 per cent; costing \$1.10 per pound, 95.09 per cent; plushes costing 60 cents per pound, 122.30 per cent; costing 98 cents per pound, 99.95 per cent; other manufactures, wholly or in part of wool, 157 per cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman does that I desire to ask him a question. The table which has just been read is what? What does the gentleman pretend that to be?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is a selection of the rates of duty from the reports of the Bureau of Statistics showing the enormous rates that are levied on some products under the Payne law.

Mr. PAYNE. Was somebody experimenting on importing four or five dollars' worth?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. PAYNE. There are those instances in the book, and only those.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They are instances of how prohibitive the rates are when there are only a few imported.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 161, nays 62, answered "present" 5, not voting 162, as follows:

YEAS—161.

Adair	Buchanan	Cullop	Foster
Adamson	Bulkley	Davis, Minn.	Fowler
Akin, N. Y.	Burke, Wis.	Dent	Francis
Alexander	Burleson	Denver	George
Anderson, Minn.	Burnett	Dickinson	Godwin, N. C.
Anderson, Ohio	Byrnes, Tenn.	Dixon, Ind.	Goeke
Ansberry	Candler	Doremus	Goodwin, Ark.
Ayres	Carlin	Driscoll, D. A.	Graham
Bathrick	Carter	Evans	Gray
Beall, Tex.	Claypool	Faison	Gregg, Pa.
Berger	Cline	Fergusson	Gudger
Blackmon	Connell	Finley	Hamill
Boehne	Conry	Fitzgerald	Hamlin
Broussard	Cox, Ind.	Flood, Va.	Hammond
Brown	Cravens	Floyd, Ark.	Hanna

Hardy	Lee, Pa.	Peters	Stephens, Cal.
Harrison, Miss.	Lenroot	Post	Stephens, Nebr.
Harrison, N. Y.	Lever	Pou	Stephens, Tex.
Haugen	Lindbergh	Rainey	Stevens, Minn.
Hay	Linthicum	Raker	Stone
Hayden	Littlepage	Ransdell, La.	Sweet
Heilin	Lloyd	Rauch	Taggart
Helgesen	Lobeck	Rees	Talcott, N. Y.
Henry, Tex.	McCoy	Relly	Thayer
Hensley	McDermott	Roberts, Mass.	Townsend
Holland	McGillicuddy	Robinson	Tribble
Houston	McKellar	Rothermel	Underhill
Howland	Maguire, Nebr.	Rubey	Underwood
Hughes, N. J.	Martin, Colo.	Rucker, Colo.	Volstead
Hull	Miller	Russell	Warburton
Humphreys, Miss.	Morrison	Sabath	Watkins
James	Morse, Wis.	Shackleford	Webb
Johnson, Ky.	Moss, Ind.	Sims	White
Johnson, S. C.	Murray	Sisson	Wilson, Pa.
Kent	Neeley	Slayden	Witherspoon
Kinkaid, Nebr.	Norris	Sloan	Woods, Iowa
Kitchin	Oldfield	Small	Young, Kans.
Korby	O'Shaunessy	Smith, Tex.	The Speaker
Lafferty	Padgett	Stanley	
La Follette	Page	Stedman	
Lee, Ga.	Pepper	Steenerson	

NAYS—62.

Alney	French	Kennedy	Prouty
Ashbrook	Fuller	Knowland	Rodenberg
Austin	Gardner, Mass.	Longworth	Simmons
Bates	Gardner, N. J.	McKinney	Smith, Saml. W.
Bowman	Gillett	McLaughlin	Sterling
Burke, S. Dak.	Good	McMorran	Sulloway
Cannon	Green, Iowa	Mann	Switzer
Catlin	Greene, Mass.	Mott	Tilson
Crago	Guernsey	Needham	Towner
Crumpacker	Hartman	Patton, Pa.	Wedemeyer
Curry	Hawley	Payne	Willis
Danforth	Howell	Pickett	Wilson, Ill.
De Forest	Hughes, W. Va.	Plumley	Wood, N. J.
Draper	Humphrey, Wash.	Porter	Young, Mich.
Driscoll, M. E.	Kahn	Pray	
Foss	Kendall	Prince	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Burgess	Palmer	Scully	Sparkman
---------	--------	--------	----------

NOT VOTING—162.

Aiken, S. C.	Doughton	Kinhead, N. J.	Randell, Tex.
Allen	Dupré	Konig	Redfield
Ames	Dwight	Konop	Reyburn
Andrus	Dyer	Kopp	Richardson
Anthony	Edwards	Lafean	Riordan
Barchfeld	Ellerbe	Lamb	Roberts, Nev.
Barnhart	Esch	Langham	Roddenbery
Bartholdt	Estopinal	Langley	Rouse
Bartlett	Fairchild	Lawrence	Rucker, Mo.
Bell, Ga.	Farr	Legare	Saunders
Boober	Ferris	Levy	Sells
Boiland	Fields	Lewis	Sharp
Bradley	Focht	Lindsay	Sheppard
Brantley	Fordney	Littleton	Sherley
Browning	Fornes	Loud	Sherwood
Burke, Pa.	Gallagher	McCall	Slemp
Byrnes, S. C.	Garner	McCreary	Smith, J. M. C.
Calder	Garrett	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Cal.
Callaway	Glass	McHenry	Smith, N. Y.
Campbell	Goldfogle	McKenzie	Speer
Cantrill	Gould	McKinley	Stack
Cary	Gregg, Tex.	Macon	Stephens, Miss.
Clark, Fla.	Griest	Madden	Sulzer
Clayton	Hamilton, Mich.	Maher	Talbott, Md.
Collier	Hamilton, W. Va.	Martin, S. Dak.	Taylor, Ala.
Cooper	Hardwick	Matthews	Taylor, Colo.
Copley	Harris	Mays	Taylor, Ohio
Covington	Hayes	Mondell	Thistlewood
Cox, Ohio	Heald	Moon, Pa.	Thomas
Curley	Helm	Moon, Tenn.	Turnbull
Currier	Henry, Conn.	Moore, Pa.	Tuttle
Dalzell	Higgins	Moore, Tex.	Utter
Daugherty	Hill	Morgan	Vare
Davenport	Hinds	Murdock	Vreeland
Davidson	Hobson	Nelson	Weeks
Davis, W. Va.	Howard	Nye	Whitacre
Dickson, Miss.	Hughes, Ga.	Olmsted	Wilder
Dies	Jackson	Parian	Wilson, N. Y.
Difenderfer	Jacoway	Patten, N. Y.	Young, Tex.
Dodds	Jones	Powers	
Donohoe	Kindred	Pujo	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he voted "aye" as above recorded.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until August 28:

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. MADDEN.

Until further notice:

Mr. ROUSE with Mr. VREELAND.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. UTTER.

Mr. KINDRED with Mr. LAWRENCE.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. BOOHER with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. BRANTLEY with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. DODDS.

Mr. COLLIER with Mr. FOCHT.

Mr. CURLEY with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.
 Mr. CLAYTON with Mr. HEALD.
 Mr. DONOHUE with Mr. HINDS.
 Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. KOPP.
 Mr. DUPRE with Mr. LAFEAN.
 Mr. GARNER with Mr. MCCREARY.
 Mr. GREGG of Texas with Mr. MCKENZIE.
 Mr. HOWARD with Mr. MCKINLEY.
 Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. MATTHEWS.
 Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey with Mr. MONDELL.
 Mr. LAMB with Mr. SELLS.
 Mr. PUJO with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH.
 Mr. SULZER with Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio.
 Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. VARE.
 Mr. SHARP with Mr. WILDER.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.
 Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. PARRAN.
 Mr. PETERS with Mr. MCCALL.
 Mr. LITTLETON with Mr. DWIGHT.
 Mr. ELLERBE with Mr. CURRIER.
 Mr. MAYS with Mr. THISTLEWOOD.
 Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. DALZELL.
 Mr. RANDELL of Texas with Mr. SMITH of California.
 Mr. RUCKER of Missouri with Mr. DYER.
 Mr. FIELDS with Mr. LANGLEY.
 Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. DAVIDSON.
 Mr. GARRETT with Mr. FORDNEY.
 Mr. HARDWICK with Mr. CAMPBELL.
 Mr. LEGARE with Mr. LOUD.
 Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. OLMS TED.
 Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi with Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota.
 Mr. RICHARDSON with Mr. REYBURN.
 Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. AMES.
 Mr. KONIG with Mr. HENRY of Connecticut.
 Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. DIES with Mr. HIGGINS.
 Mr. DEFENDERFER with Mr. FARR.
 Mr. RODDENBERRY with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.
 Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. GRIEST.
 Mr. REDFIELD with Mr. SPEER.
 Mr. PALMER with Mr. HILL (with mutual privilege of transfer).
 Mr. HUGHES of Georgia with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. MOON of Tennessee with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. COX of Ohio with Mr. ANTHONY.
 For balance of session:
 Mr. TURNBULL with Mr. HAYES.
 Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. LANGHAM.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. SLEMP.
 Mr. BURGESS with Mr. WEEKS.
 Mr. FURNES with Mr. BRADLEY.
 Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. BUTLER.
 Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. HILL, voted?
 The SPEAKER. He has not.
 Mr. PALMER. Then I desire to withdraw my vote of "aye" and answer "present."
 The name of Mr. PALMER was called, and he answered "Present."
 Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, may I withdraw my vote? I am paired with Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I am making my daily statement.
 The SPEAKER. How did the gentleman vote?
 Mr. BUTLER. I voted "no."
 The SPEAKER. Call the gentleman's name.
 The name of Mr. BUTLER was called, and he answered "Present."
 Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye."
 The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called?
 Mr. LEVY. No, sir.
 The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.
 Mr. LEVY. I had just reached the door when the roll was concluded.
 The SPEAKER. It makes no difference; if the gentleman was not in the Hall, he can not vote.
 Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not make an explanation about his not voting.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is recognized for an hour.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I shall exceed the hour, but I would like to proceed without feeling that I am under restraint as to time. I shall not trespass upon the time of the House, and I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] asks unanimous consent to be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do not think many minutes over the hour.

Mr. MANN. I shall not object.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, in closing his spectacular remarks, said:

Mr. Chairman, I shall not go much further into the record of this anti-Jefferson, antiforeign, antilabor, antisoldier, and pro-Chinese candidate for the Presidency.

This statement is not in keeping with the facts and is a cunning effort to present false issues to the American voters. The gentleman should have known, or could have known with the slightest investigation, that his charges are absolutely unwarranted. The plain truth is Gov. Wilson is not against foreign immigration, labor, and the soldiers of our country, and is not an advocate of Chinese immigration. The gentleman knows this, and if he desired to be candid with the country would correctly state the truth of current politics. I here deny and challenge his statements. Gov. Wilson stands before the country as the Democratic nominee in courageous attitude, with nothing to conceal, with no apologies to make, and as the one candidate aspiring to the Presidency unfettered, independent, clean in politics, able, faithful, and with an incomparable record of public service. In this contest the chance remarks of any candidate made or written in the past will count for naught.

What the candidate and his party stand for, with the ability and intention to faithfully perform pledges and platform promises, will be the supreme test. And from that standpoint we present our candidate, with a brilliant record of official achievement as executive of his State, with every promise literally and faithfully redeemed, in contrast with Taft and Roosevelt, whose records are shattered, with pledges and platform promises unredeemed, with faithless words of hope to the people long since forgotten by both of them. We enter the fray with eagerness and go to the people with the pledge that our candidate stands for the things that will bring relief to the overburdened masses and will keep his party's pledged word, as he has kept it in the past, and challenge its comparison with the historic fact that Mr. Taft won the votes of the people with his pledges and his party platform, and after the election turned his back upon those who had lifted him into his high office and utterly failed in his performances, as was done by Mr. Roosevelt, the candidate of George W. Perkins, E. H. Gary, and the Steel Trust, the greatest financial organization in the world's history. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We gladly join issue and enter the lists with the Republican candidates and the cause they typify; and Democracy's candidate will not be found apologetic, timid, and shirking the issue, but brave and able and honest in the people's struggle.

RODENBERG ON "PRACTICAL POLITICS."

RODENBERG says:

In this enlightened day and age, when the standard of general intelligence is higher than it has ever been, the personality of the candidate becomes in a very large measure the platform of his party. The people are more vitally interested in ascertaining the honest convictions of the candidate, formed in a time of sober and mature reflection, uninfluenced by ambition or hope of political preferment, than they are in any professions or promises contained in a platform which they know has been constructed to meet the exigencies of practical politics.

This quotation from the gentleman's speech indicates the quality of his politics. It places him in the class of "practical politicians," where he aspires to be numbered.

Again, it thoroughly explains and establishes another thing, perhaps not intended by him, to wit, why the Republican Party and Mr. Taft, in 1908, at Chicago promised specific things to the American people in their platform and then, after deceiving them as to "tariff revision" and certain other things, deliberately and faithlessly repudiated their solemn pledges and raised the tariff burdens, because, as RODENBERG says, "pro-

fessions or promises contained in a platform" must "be constructed to meet the exigencies of practical politics." Hence, that Chicago platform was made to deceive the people, and, according to the gentleman from Illinois, Taft was the real platform and embodiment of his party's intentions and only nominated for the purpose of repudiating such platform, as he did on the tariff and other issues after he was elected, and through his real self serve the special interests regardless of party pledges. The gentleman from Illinois calls that "practical politics." He wishes to be so classified, and I promptly accord him the coveted honor. According to his standard, the platform is only made to delude, and the candidate, as a "practical politician," must conceal his real views and convictions till the ballots are cast and then trample his party's pledges into the dirt as meaningless, in accordance with Mr. Taft's well-known record.

WILSON ON THOMAS JEFFERSON.

The gentleman quotes a brief extract from two of Gov. Wilson's books—the History of the American People and The Life of George Washington. They read:

The difference between Mr. Jefferson and Gen. Jackson was not a difference of moral quality so much as a difference in social stock and breeding. Mr. Jefferson, an aristocrat, and yet a philosophical radical, deliberately practiced the arts of the politician and exhibited oftentimes the sort of insincerity which subtle natures yield to without loss of essential integrity.

Washington found him a guide who needed watching.

Read those extracts in regard to every quotation made and the gentleman frequently confuses and misinterprets their real meaning. Gov. Wilson has not written a thing in any book for which he should apologize before the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The true answer to this effort to prejudice the public mind against Gov. Wilson is that such tactics are puerile. Because if the great Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, could return to this earth to-day he would be found following the flag of Woodrow Wilson in this contest, just as we find that illustrious living Democrat, William J. Bryan, giving adherence to the Democratic nominee against the party of unredeemed and broken promises [applause on the Democratic side], members of which are now lost in confusion trying to follow Taft and Roosevelt, both of whom have given and would give aid and comfort to the special privileged classes and interests seeking favors at the hands of the Government.

The "cocked-hat" letter brought Bryan and Wilson together, and so would Wilson's fight against the greed of trusts, special privilege, and avarice unite Jefferson and Wilson in this fight for the people, could the Sage of Monticello be permitted to return to the scenes of earthly action.

WILSON ON FOREIGN IMMIGRATION.

Again, the gentleman from Illinois undertakes to prejudice the minds of this House and the country against Wilson in regard to foreigners and foreign immigration. He totally misinterprets the distinguished governor on that subject. He understands full well that Gov. Wilson is not opposed to worthy foreigners of every clime in the universe coming to our country as the abode of liberty to make this Republic their home. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us analyze the language. And I intend to set it out in the Record so that the American people may scrutinize it:

Now, there came multitudes of men of the lowest class from the south of Italy and men of the meaner sort out of Hungary and Poland, men out of the ranks where there was neither skill nor energy nor any initiative of quick intelligence; and they came in numbers which increased from year to year, as if the countries of the south of Europe were disburdening themselves of the more sordid and hapless elements of their population. The people of the Pacific coast had clamored these many years against the admission of immigrants out of China, and in May, 1892, got at last what they wanted—a Federal statute which practically excluded from the United States all Chinese who had not already acquired the right of residence; and yet the Chinese were more to be desired, as workmen if not as citizens, than most of the coarse crew that came crowding in every year at the eastern ports.

Consider the meaning of the expression, "men of the meaner sort." What did Wilson mean when he said, "More to be desired as workmen"? By whom "desired"? Wilson does not say by himself. I answer RODENBERG with his own words, expressed immediately following his quotation and comment thereon. In the same speech in which he arraigns Wilson he says:

While I believe in the strict enforcement of our immigration laws, to protect us against the vicious, the lawless, and the depraved, yet I would not draw the line against admitting immigrants who, judged by our own experience, possess the possibility of developing into useful American citizenship.

He, too, charges that there are the "vicious," the "depraved," the "lawless" in foreign countries. Does he wish them for

American citizens? Does any right-thinking man of any nationality desire such immigration? The mere propounding of the query answers the point with every patriotic voter. Are not the views of Wilson and RODENBERG identical on immigration? He, too, would exclude the "vicious," the "lawless," and the "depraved." Are they not the "meaner sort" to which Gov. Wilson referred?

I challenge and defy the gentleman to point to a single instance where Wilson ever in his history or elsewhere said one word against the worthy immigrants from Italy, Poland, or Hungary, the homes of Garibaldi, Kosciuszko, and Kossuth.

Again let Wilson speak for himself. In refuting these false interpretations and charges, he wrote a letter to N. O. Piotrowski, Esq., of Chicago. The gentleman can not arouse the prejudice of the foreigners against Gov. Wilson by such claptrap argument. The letter is well worth perusal by every liberty-loving American citizen and every man throughout the country who loves freedom and good government:

[Personal.]

MARCH 13, 1912.

MY DEAR MR. PIOTROWSKI: I remember with pleasure meeting you when I was in Chicago, and esteem it a privilege to reply to your frank and interesting letter of March 11.

My history was written on so condensed a scale that I am only too well aware that passages such as you quote are open to misconstruction, though I think their meaning is plain when they are fairly scrutinized. No one who knows anything of the history of Europe can fail to be familiar with the distinguished history of the Polish people, and any writer who spoke without discrimination of members of that nation as constituting an undesirable element in population would not only be doing a gross injustice but exhibiting a great ignorance. I did not know all of the facts you so interestingly set forth in your letter, but I did know, in a general way, of the honorable and useful careers of the Polish citizens of America and the self-respect and steady achievement of the Polish communities which have been established in various parts of the country. In the passage quoted from my history I was speaking of a particular time when it had become the practice of certain employers on this side of the water to import large numbers of unskilled laborers under contract for the purpose of displacing American labor, for which they would have been obliged to pay more.

Here permit me to give the instances. The American Woolen Co. imported foreigners from every part of the earth to Lawrence, Mass., and paid children in their factories two and three dollars a week and adults six and seven dollars a week. This great protected industry allowed the children to pay five and ten cents a week for water, and saw them crying for bread and shivering for clothing around their very factory doors. And still the Republican Party must protect the Woolen Trust.

They were drawing, in many cases, upon a class of people who would not have come of their own motion and who were not truly representative of the finer elements of the countries from which they came.

I know that a just and thoughtful man like yourself will pay no attention to the miscellaneous misinterpretations which have been put upon the passage referred to, and that you will have already interpreted my meaning as I have here endeavored to interpret it.

Your letter has very graciously afforded me an opportunity to make this explanation.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

HON. N. O. PIOTROWSKI,

City Attorney, 59 Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

And as late as July 22, 1912, at Seagirt, N. J., Gov. Wilson, in a signed statement, gave his views on foreigners and foreign immigration to Mr. Geza Kende, the able editor of the Hungarian paper, *Amerikai Magyar Nepszava*, of New York:

"I believe in the reasonable restriction of immigration, but not in any restriction which will exclude from the country honest, industrious men who are seeking what America has always offered, an asylum for those who seek a free field. The whole question is a very difficult one, but I think can be solved with justice and generosity. Anyone who has the least knowledge of Hungarian history must feel that stock to have proved itself fit for liberty and opportunity.

"I never have had any objection to sound immigration from any country," he said, and being asked just how he defined "sound immigration," he said he referred to the coming of honest men and women from other lands whose presence in the United States is not calculated to interfere with the health and moral conditions of this country.

It is a wholly false insinuation to say that ever Wilson for a single day of his life opposed the right kind of immigration to our country. Never did he breathe or write such opposition anywhere.

The gentleman will fail in his efforts to prejudice the voter. His party must meet the real issue. For more than a generation the American people have been moving up to this great conflict, and the battle is on. Democracy asks no quarter at the hands of the opposition. We know that Wilson carries the flag typifying the rights of the people and are confident of victory in November. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us examine how this charge, oft repeated, has affected the foreigners in our country. Here is what they say through their

papers. As a matter of fact, the mendacious use of these quotations when the situation is once explained, has failed to deceive the people most intimately concerned. Foremost in repudiating these attacks are the Italians and Poles themselves. The leading newspapers in representing the nationalities are placing Gov. Wilson in a proper light. The editor of *La Voce del Popolo*, the national Italian newspaper in New York, after writing to Gov. Wilson and receiving an explanation, has come to his support.

All Italians can be satisfied—

Says this paper—

with Gov. Wilson's frank and clear explanation. Gov. Wilson has now made it entirely plain, and a man who has no political or party ends to serve gladly acknowledges it. We have had the greatest esteem for Woodrow Wilson ever since he became governor of New Jersey and undertook to eliminate corruption, and we entertain toward him to-day the same deep and disinterested admiration.

So we have here an explanation of the feeling with which that quotation has been received by the so-called foreigner. Let me for a moment refer to the record of gentlemen on that side of the aisle in regard to the labor question, the Chinese issue. The gentleman from Illinois undertook to place Gov. Wilson in the attitude of being a pro-Chinese advocate, and his party with having opposed the immigration of the Chinese to this country.

He is indeed ignorant of history, or else seems to be ready to suppress some of the facts. Why, do you know that back in the early eighties, when the American laborer was endeavoring to secure action excluding the Chinese from this country, the Democratic Party was advocating that legislation and the Republican Party, almost in solid phalanx, stood on that side of the aisle favoring the Chinese? [Applause on the Democratic side.] The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that two Congresses passed bills to exclude the Chinese from the Pacific shores and other parts of our country, and two Republican Presidents vetoed these Chinese-exclusion acts. It was a Democratic House that passed a Chinese-exclusion act in 1892. Back in those days two Republican Presidents stood by the Chinese and against the American laborer. Presidents Arthur and Hayes vetoed these Chinese-exclusion bills, and when they came back to Congress the Democrats, almost in solid fashion, voted to pass the bills over the vetoes of these Republican Presidents, and nearly every Republican voted in favor of the Chinese coming here in competition with American labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On January 28, 1879, Hayes sent his veto message to Congress; and on March 1, 1879, 83 Democrats could only secure the pitiful number of 22 Republican Members to vote with them to pass the bill over the veto, while 81 Republicans voted "nay," and the veto prevailed. I am sure RODENBERG's face will blush with shame when he reads that vote of his party.

Then, in 1882, another bill excluding the Chinese laborers was passed by Democrats; and on March 9, 1882, Arthur vetoed that. And in the Senate 31 Democrats voted to pass the bill over his veto, and could not secure a single Republican Senator to vote with them, while 28 voted with the Chinamen and against the bill. And when the bill came up in the House on April 17, 1882, 103 Democrats voted to pass it over the President's veto, and few Republicans dared to defy the protective-tariff lords and vote with the Democrats.

And now, Mr. RODENBERG, when you talk about your party opposing Chinese laborers, I can only cry "Shame!" And yet the gentleman from Illinois says that his party defended the American laborer. Ah, Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party ought not to take the flattering unctious to its soul that it did anything for the American laborer. For 14 years I have sat on this floor and have seen Republican Speakers occupying that chair refuse to allow legislation favorable to labor to come before this House.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] during his incumbency as Speaker of the House, whenever the labor people came to him and asked for legislation to prevent government by injunction, remedies limiting the power of Federal judges in the issuance of injunctions, touching trial by jury in cases of indirect contempt, and kindred measures, scoffed at their demand and turned them away from the door of the Speaker's room. Year after year we have heard them appeal for legislation, and not until the Democratic Party came into power two years ago was their cry heeded. This very Congress has passed a bill limiting the power of Federal injunctions, the power of petty judicial tyrants. Such enactment will prohibit them from governing people through the writ of injunction. When we brought the bill to the floor of the House for consideration, the Republican Party that had sat here for all these years stifling legislation became afraid and did not have courage to vote against the relief demanded by labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When we brought up the measure providing for jury trial in cases of indirect contempt, a splendid measure which is now pending at the other end of the Capitol, Democrats supported and pressed it. When a division was demanded, the Republicans, who for 15 years had suppressed this legislation, did not have the courage to again suppress it, but ran to cover and voted with the Democrats. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is idle to boast of the Republican Party being the friend of labor and Wilson being inimicable to their interests. We are glad to welcome the issue, and when we have finished this contest it will be ascertained that we are standing by the people, and the Republican Party is still consistently fighting the battle of the special interests, as they have always done. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that the standpat Republican from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG], who loved the former Speaker of this House [Mr. CANNON] so well that he characterized him as the "Iron Duke of the Republican Party," should assail the candidate of the Democratic Party. There could be no more fitting representative to make this assault on Democracy's nominee than the distinguished gentleman from the East St. Louis district, whose record is so graphically portrayed in the magazine of Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE. The recital of the record is commended to the consideration of all those who wish to read an interesting congressional biography of the gentleman now assailing Democracy's nominee.

GOV. WILSON'S NEW JERSEY RECORD.

Permit me here to proceed with the consideration of Wilson's magnificent record as governor of New Jersey. That State for more than 15 years had been under the control of the Republican Party. If there was a boss-ridden State in the Union it was the State of New Jersey, and the man who is now the standard bearer of the Democratic Party converted a great Republican State completely dominated by the special interests into a Democratic State of 50,000 majority. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He made promises to the people and redeemed every one to the letter. The test is not what may be taken from one or two sentences in a book, but where does this man stand and what has he accomplished and is he honest? In less than six months he accomplished more for the people than had been done in that State for 20 years.

There were four laws put on the statute book of New Jersey that should alone commend Gov. Wilson not only to the people of his own State but to the voters of the entire country. The people, as I say, were under the domination of the bosses in New Jersey and could not control their own elections. Gov. Wilson demanded a direct-primary law in which the bosses could be eliminated and every voter could walk up to the polls and express his choice. Permit me to recite to you some of the provisions of that law, in order that you may see how well he kept his word.

NEW JERSEY ELECTION LAW.

The election law provides:

Direct primaries.—The people, not the self-constituted bosses, name the candidates openly at a regularly conducted, legally constituted election, not privately in a corner.

The Geran election law insures against repeating. A voter in a municipality of over 5,000 must register personally and sign his name to the registration book. When he comes to cast his ballot he must again sign the poll book. If a voter attempts to vote on another's name he must forge the signature. Forgery means imprisonment if detected, and there is the signature on the registration book as a check.

The election law chooses election officers from a list of candidates who have passed a civil-service examination. These men know the law and their duties under it. They are also familiar with the penalties for any violation of the law. Under its provisions the people have taken their government into their own hands. [Applause.]

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY AND WORKINGMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT.

Next we will consider the employers' liability and workingmen's compensation act. It is the crowning act of justice to employees.

This law prescribes the liability of an employer to make compensation for injuries received by an employee in the course of employment. It establishes an elective schedule of compensation and regulates the procedure for determining the liability and compensation of each party. It provides that an employee who is injured need not sue to obtain damages. A regular schedule covering the different classes of injuries is drawn up and the employer's liability is set opposite each. It is fair and just to those employed, because in case of accident it secures to them without delay a fixed income at a time when it is most needed. It avoids a long-drawn-out litigation, with its attendant expense, delay, and suffering. It abolishes the barbaric

doctrines of assumed risk, the negligence of fellow servants, and contributory negligence. [Applause.] Let laboring men consider that measure, which has taken them from under the iron heel of corporations and placed them where they may speedily get their rights when injury occurs, and where their families may be compensated in case of death. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Pursuing his four great measures, let us next analyze

THE CORRUPT-PRACTICES ACT.

This law provides for a committee to receive and expend campaign funds. It directs that this committee make an itemized statement showing every receipt and expenditure, together with the sources from which the money came, which shall be filed as a public document and shall be open to inspection by any citizen. Each candidate must file a sworn statement of his personal contributions to the campaign committee, and this statement must show the names of any persons who paid, loaned, contributed, or otherwise furnished any moneys to said candidate in aid of his election or nomination. If any candidate does not file such statement within the period required by law he forfeits the office to which he was elected.

The law prohibits the use of money to secure election to office in excess of these clearly specified amounts:

A candidate for governor may spend.....	\$2,500
A candidate for Congress may spend.....	1,500
A candidate for any county office.....	500
A candidate for State senate.....	500
A candidate for general assembly.....	250
A candidate for any municipal office.....	250

These sums can not be spent by the candidates personally, but must be disbursed by the legally appointed campaign committee. This provision can not be evaded by spending larger sums through relatives, corporate associates, or friends. The law construes all such contributions as part of the candidate's personal contribution. The law prohibits corporations from contributing to the campaign fund of any candidate or any political party. It prohibits colonizing, betting on the result of the election, intimidating voters by threat or otherwise; printing political expressions on pay envelopes, posting political handbills on factories by individuals or corporations.

And the Democratic Party has passed through the House a bill providing for publicity of campaign contributions and expenditures before nomination as well as afterwards, and it was passed by almost a unanimous vote. If it ever gets out of the other end of the Capitol and gets up Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House, we may know something about the sources of funds of the candidates for President. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As one of Gov. Wilson's great achievements will stand out the act reviving and placing teeth in the obsolete New Jersey commission law in the enactment known as the—

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION.

The public utilities board is given general supervision of, and control over, all public utilities, and also their property, property rights, equipment, facilities, and franchises, so far as may be necessary, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act. The term "public utility" is legally defined to include every individual, copartnership, association, corporation, or joint-stock company, their lessees, trustees, or receivers appointed by any court whatsoever, that now or hereafter may own, operate, manage, or control, within the State of New Jersey, any steam railroad, street railway, traction railway, canal, express, subway, pipe line, gas, electric light, heat, power, water, oil, sewer, telephone, telegraph system, plant, or equipment for public use, under privileges granted or hereafter to be granted by the State of New Jersey or by any political subdivision thereof.

This board has power, either upon its own initiative or upon complaint in writing, to investigate any matter concerning any public utility as herein defined. It can appraise and value property. It can fix rates, test appliances, fix junction points and connections, fix rates of depreciation, prohibit unjust discrimination, regulate extensions of indebtedness and capitalization of franchises, and it must approve all sales, leases, or mortgages and all transfers of stock to other companies. All franchises or grants by municipalities come under its jurisdiction.

POWERS OF THE BOARD.

The board can compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of records. No witness may escape testifying on the ground of incrimination, and no immunity can inure to any witness on account of his testimony.

All orders of the board to continue service or rates in effect at the time said order is made shall be immediately operative; all other orders shall become effective upon the date specified therein, which shall be at least 20 days after the date of said order.

Violations of the provisions of the law subject every officer who participates to personal punishment for misdemeanor, and

every public-service corporation must file a sworn analysis of its methods of doing business, so that the officers responsible may in every case be identified. In default of compliance with any order of the board, when the same shall become effective the person or public utility affected thereby shall be subject to a penalty of \$100 per day for every day during which such default continues to be recovered in an action of debt in the name of the State. No finer law for regulating public-service corporations can be found in any State. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Since the gentleman from Illinois has deliberately assailed Gov. Wilson with a spirit akin to malevolence, and charged that he is not a friend of labor, let me set out more at length for the sake of truthful history and the benefit of honest voters his exact record touching labor measures. Here it is. The following labor laws were passed under his administration:

Fire-escape law, amending factory laws, and placing New Jersey in the vanguard of States in the protection of workers in factories and workshops.

Regulating employment agencies and licensing the same.

Making the improper influencing of labor representatives or foremen a misdemeanor.

Employers' liability and compensation act.

Prohibiting the employment of children in mercantile establishments during school hours; providing for a 58-hour week; and prohibiting children under 16 years to work between the hours of 7 p. m. and 7 a. m.

Appointment of commissioners on old-age pensions and old-age insurance.

Providing for the safety and health of foundry workers by minimizing drafts and doing away with noxious gases, and so forth, by exhaust fans in foundries.

Increasing factory inspectors by the number of 6—making in all a total of 17—for the better enforcement of factory and workshop laws.

Eight-hour day on State, county, and municipal work.

Providing for at least one-half hour meal time for six continuous hours of labor.

A plumbers' license act.

Providing for sanitation in bakeshops, and so forth, and also compelling the licensing of same.

Prohibiting the employment of persons under 21 years in first-class cities and 18 years in second-class cities as telephone or telegraph messengers between the hours of 10 p. m. and 5 a. m.

A semimonthly pay act for railroad employees.

Eliminating contract labor in penal institutions and providing for a State-use system.

And because of this magnificent record in behalf of the toiling masses, the laboring people of New Jersey love this governor. When he went into office he found her citizens prostrate under the tyranny and oppression of the bosses and tools of the special interests, and before six months had expired he had written all these things into the statutes of New Jersey and redeemed his pledges which he made during the campaign. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He had done more in these few months than all the Republicans for 20 years; and yet we hear this idle talk that Wilson is not the friend of labor. We meet the Republican Party on any part of the ground in this contest, and our candidate will be found able to stand any sort of test applied to him. [Applause.] The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] has undertaken to put the stigma of unfriendliness to labor on the New Jersey governor. Let us see how well he can succeed. After these things above recited were performed by Gov. Wilson and the legislature under his administration, here is what the labor organization of New Jersey said. This is the message they sent to the people throughout the country. I incorporate it in my remarks in order that every honest voter may read it and see what the laboring people think of him in his own State. Because of this magnificent record in behalf of the toiling masses a glowing resolution was adopted by the labor people showing the high esteem in which Gov. Wilson is held because of those faithful performances. After reciting the large number of new laws passed by the Wilson administration favorable to labor, these resolutions were adopted:

Resolved, That the executive board of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor, representing the organized workers of New Jersey, in regular session assembled this 13th day of February, 1912, at Trenton, N. J., hereby commend His Excellency Gov. Woodrow Wilson for his unremitting and untiring efforts in assisting to bring about better conditions for the wage earners of New Jersey: And be it further

Resolved, That the administration of Gov. Wilson be indorsed by the New Jersey State Federation of Labor, and that copies of these preambles and resolutions be forwarded to Gov. Woodrow Wilson, the public press of New Jersey, and the various labor organizations throughout the United States.

NEW JERSEY STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR.
HENRY F. HILFERS, Secretary.
CORNELIUS FORD, President.

This record ought to bring a quick apology from the gentleman from Illinois if he believes in a square deal and the truthful recital of facts. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Contrast such record with the miserable failure of Taft and Roosevelt in the performance of anything for the benefit of the laboring masses. The laboring people in New Jersey honor and love Wilson, and those who believe in truth and justice must quickly acquiesce in this statement if they make honest investigation. We challenge gentlemen to deny that statement. Gov. Wilson stands before this country as the friend of labor, while the Republican Party has made its record of broken promises. The labor organizations went to the Republican national convention in Chicago four years ago and you spurned them; you turned them away from that great convention. They went there this year and the Republican Party again turned a deaf ear. They went to the Baltimore convention and presented their requests and Democracy placed those requests in our platform, and we intend to redeem every one of them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

WILSON AND BRYAN.

The gentleman endeavors to fan into flames of fury a supposed difference between the Speaker of this House and William J. Bryan. It is not my purpose or province to here discuss the incident. Suffice it to say the Speaker is loyally supporting the nominee of his party, while the gentleman from Illinois seeks to defame Democracy's standard bearer. The Speaker of this House has been able to take care of himself on every occasion, and I am sure has not lost his superb ability in that respect, and will continue to do so. He is present in this House and needs no defense here when his name is brought in issue except his eloquent tongue, high character, and own strong record. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman from Nebraska, thrice the standard bearer of a great party, is absent and can not in this forum resent the vicious and almost brutal assault made on his good name by the strong standpat Republican from Illinois. This occasion is not the first one upon which the gentleman from Illinois in violent and unwarranted and, I might say, malevolent language has attacked the name and political integrity of the distinguished Nebraskan. Replying to the studied and almost indecent assault of the Illinois Member, permit me to say that no living American is better loved than Bryan. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Millions of citizens follow his unsullied flag of leadership, knowing full well that when his sword leaps from its scabbard it will be to fight in their defense. For two decades he has defiantly led the people's fight against entrenched privilege and predatory special interests. He is truly the Great Commoner of America. Ranking with Jefferson and Jackson and the immortal names enriching the achievements of Democracy, his name will be emblazoned in the permanent annals of history as the people's idol and courageous friend. [Applause on the Democratic side.] His character will stand forth in history typifying him as the people's redeemer in the century's struggle for political freedom and individual rights. Generations to come will teach their descendants to emulate his life as a model of consistency and ideal Christian citizenship. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

WILSON NOT AGAINST THE SOLDIERS.

The gentleman's quotation from Gov. Wilson's "History of the American People" is as follows, touching pensions. He seeks to array the old soldiers against Wilson:

What most attracted the attention of the country, aside from his action in the matter of appointments to office, was the extraordinary number of his vetoes. Most of them were uttered against pension bills, great and small. Both Democratic House and Republican Senate were inclined to grant any man or class of men who had served in the Federal Armies during the Civil War the right to be supported under the National Treasury, and Mr. Cleveland set himself resolutely to check their extravagance. He deemed it enough that those who had been actually disabled should receive pensions from the Government and regarded additional gifts for mere service both an unjustifiable use of the public money and a gross abuse of charity.

No other human being but the gentleman from Illinois would contend that Wilson was doing anything except giving Cleveland's position from his standpoint. He was not making such contention for himself.

The Baltimore platform reads:

We renew the declarations of our last platform relating to generous pensions.

I declare that Wilson stands squarely on this plank and will carry forward its provisions with sacred fidelity. The gentleman plainly, and apparently knowingly, misinterprets the language quoted. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen, such are the quotations made from Gov. Wilson's books intended to condemn him before the American people. They have already been read and reread in every part of this country prior to the Baltimore convention, and in that forum

these things were all considered, and finally in spite of them Gov. Wilson was triumphantly nominated. Notwithstanding these unjust attacks, he is the choice of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to contrast him with the candidates of the other party. It is not what a man has said in years gone upon which the people are going to try the candidates in this contest. They will say to themselves, "What has this man accomplished? Is he honest, and what will he do if we elevate him to the Presidency?" There are some plain things that I shall charge here in contrasting these candidates.

CONTRASTING WILSON WITH TAFT AND ROOSEVELT.

First, let me analyze the political character of Theodore Africanus, the Mad Mullah of American politics. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He parades himself as the people's advocate, and yet I charge and will establish that he is the friend and instrument of the special interests and the predatory classes seeking favors at the hands of the Government. In fact, I think and feel sure their causes and interests are linked together as "two souls with but a single thought, two hearts that beat as one." Roosevelt, ensconced on the bosom of Perkins, Gary, and the minions of the Steel Trust, whispers sweet sympathy in their ears in New York City and is sent forth in the rest of the country to preach a sham crusade in behalf of the people's rights and against the trusts and predatory interests. We owe the duty of plain speech in this crisis, and I do not intend to fall to-day in its performance as a representative of the people. Before I have finished I believe it can be established that Roosevelt is backed by those interests and will become their willing instrument in the future, as he was in the past when President.

But, first, however, permit me to read some utterances from the books and speeches of Roosevelt, showing his attitude toward "labor," the "farmers," and "government by injunction." In comparison with these statements the quotations from Gov. Wilson reproduced by the gentleman from Illinois are as mild as a May morning. Here they are:

ROOSEVELT'S ESTIMATES
OF COWBOYS.

They are much better fellows and pleasanter companions than small farmers or agricultural laborers; nor are the mechanics and workmen of a great city to be mentioned in the same breath.

We relish the memory of the cowboys, but why should he contemptuously stigmatize the farmers, mechanics, and workmen of the cities?

OF FARMERS.

I shall confine my remarks to what Gen. Porter has said about patriotism. Patriotism comes first, and I hope you will not fail to display it next Tuesday. Mr. Bryan and his adherents have appealed to the basest set in the land—the farmers.

OF OPPONENTS OF GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION.

The men who object to what they style "government by injunction" are, as regards the essential principles of government, in hearty sympathy with their remote skin-clad ancestors who lived in caves, fought one another with stone-headed axes, and ate the mammoth and woolly rhinoceros. They are interesting as representing a geological survival, but they are dangerous whenever there is the least chance of their making the principles of this ages-buried past living factors in our present life. They are not in sympathy with men of good minds and sound civic morality.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, has it come to this, that I am associating in this House with friends of labor like HUGHES of New Jersey, ROBERT E. LEE and WILSON of Pennsylvania, BUCHANAN, of Illinois, and a score of labor representatives who are "not in sympathy with men of good minds and sound civic morality"? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

ROOSEVELT'S CONNECTION WITH MERGER OF TENNESSEE CO. AND STEEL TRUST.

Let us analyze thoroughly his disgraceful connection with the merger of the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co. as a part of the Steel Trust. Here his unholy alliance and conspiracy with them began. Here he linked up with and became a part and parcel of the Steel Trust and became Perkins's and Gary's friend, ally, and instrument. They constitute the greatest financial organization and combination in the world's history. He has never forsaken them and is now making this fight for them and under their wing and direction. They have not separated and will not should he again win the Presidency, as long as Roosevelt serves them with the same fidelity characterizing his conduct in the absorption of the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co. and the indecent and outrageous covering up and suppression of the misdeeds and crimes of the Harvester Trust officials, his other political sponsors and financial backers in this contest.

Permit me to discuss Perkins and his methods for a few moments in order to lay his real character before this presence. I have had a good Democrat, who knows Perkins through and through, to make an estimate of him and his devious political

and financial methods in order that I may photograph it in this record and show the kind of "birds" that "flock together" when Roosevelt and Perkins are "flocking" with one another. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Here is his estimate:

Roosevelt will have at his disposal as much money as both the other parties, and he has in Mr. George W. Perkins the most astute, untiring, and far-seeing organizer that our country has ever known. Do not for a moment underrate Mr. Perkins. I know him and his methods almost as intimately as any man can know them. It is to Mr. Perkins's efforts that the United States Steel Corporation and the Harvester Co. owe more of their organization at the outset than to any other man. It will be found that he and his assistants are now silently at work in their underground way setting up Roosevelt clubs and organizations all over the land, and that by autumn he will have a more perfect machine.

How do these things look, showing Roosevelt's financial affiliations and political moorings as compared with the clean and honorable man against whom the gentleman from Illinois urges quotations showing merely political opinions as written in his books? Compare these two candidates, and which must suffer the most in public esteem?

Permit me here to analyze the Harvester Trust conspiracy between Roosevelt, Herbert Knox Smith, Strauss, George W. Perkins, and E. H. Gary. If those things had been known to the American people when they happened under Roosevelt impeachment proceedings would have resulted and criminal prosecution been demanded against Perkins, Gary, and the McCormicks.

Allow me to call attention of Representatives to a few facts. This merger occurred in 1907. Gary came to Washington; Perkins also came, and they went to Roosevelt when he was President of the United States and asked if they could make the merger, and he agreed to it. He said, "I was personally cognizant of and responsible for its every detail." He did not stand in the way of it, and authorized the Steel Trust to absorb their greatest competitor for a price far less than the real value of the holding. Again he said, "I felt no public duty of mine to interpose any objection." Clandestinely he knowingly allowed them to get a huge monopoly on the iron-ore and raw-material supply of the country.

What did it mean? It meant that the special interests composed of his personal friends could go to him and confer with him. Let not the attitude of the Democracy and of our candidate be misunderstood. We are not against wealth legitimately acquired. We are not opposed to legitimate corporate interests; we believe they are essential. But we are against monopolies, we are opposed to combinations in restraint of trade, and we do oppose these men who would secretly conspire with the President of the United States in violation of the antitrust laws of the country, as was done by these conspirators with Roosevelt, and as was found and denounced as criminal by the Senate committee in 1907. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The absorption appears to have been contrary to the provisions of the antitrust law. * * * The transaction appears to be within the prohibition of the Federal statute. * * * And the President was not authorized to permit the absorption of the Tennessee Co. by the Steel Corporation.

Thus the committee found. He knew he was violating the law, but wished to accommodate the Steel Trust magnates, his personal friends, and did not stop at the violation of his oath and the laws of his country if he could make himself solid with these commercial pirates whom he expected to aid and finance him in his campaigns.

We are making no assault on wealth. We would defend the legitimate rights of the corporations as loyally as those of the individual. We are engaging in no warfare on corporations; we would defend their just rights as faithfully as we would those of the humblest citizen of this land. But what Democracy and her candidate stand for is absolute equality before the law whether it be a corporation or an individual. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If the Senate of the United States will allow the Pujo bill, endowing the Money Trust committee with ample power, now pending there, to come out of the Senate and become a law, the American people will know more about this unholy alliance. I do not know whether they dare to let it come forth or not, but we ought to have the truth and understand these questions. Already the committee investigating the Money Trust affairs have uncovered enough things to repay us for ordering the investigation. It can be badly crippled if the special interests can smother the bill.

Perkins and Gary and the Steel Trust and the Harvester Trust are running and financing Roosevelt. Let me remind you that recently in the city of New York the Money Trust Investigating Committee, upon slight inquiry, ascertained that in 1907, the same year in which Roosevelt winked at and allowed the combination of the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co. and the Steel Trust, within 48 hours there was sent from the Treasury of the United States of the people's money \$42,000,000,

without one dime of interest, to J. Pierpont Morgan, ostensibly to stop the panic of that year. He instructed his Secretary, Mr. Cortelyou, to carry the money to the Wall Street gamblers, speculating in stocks and bonds and illegal transactions throughout this country, to be parceled out to them by Morgan and Perkins and that coterie of financiers. Morgan told the American people that he stopped the panic with his money, that it was \$25,000,000 of his money that brought an end to the panic, *whereas this investigation has revealed that it was the money of the people, taken secretly from the vaults of the Treasury and carried to New York under the direction of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Cortelyou, in order that it might be loaned to these gamblers on Wall Street without interest.* [Applause on the Democratic side.] Perkins said to Morgan in the conference, when Cortelyou was there: "I think you ought to loan \$25,000,000 to stop this panic." Morgan said, "All right; you can have my money," and then Perkins said, "Mr. Morgan, I think you ought to parcel this \$25,000,000 out to various men and institutions in New York." Parcel it out! How? They parceled out the people's tax money to stock gamblers, the men who had been fattening and feasting on the bone and sinew and blood of our citizens for the last 40 years.

Morgan took the people's money and concealed the fact, and boasted that he stopped the panic, and charged those gamblers interest. The Money Trust investigation revealed the fact that the people thought Morgan had been their savior. In 1907 we have this combination between these two great rivals in the iron and steel business, and in 1907 the Treasury of the United States was looted by the Secretary of the Treasury, under the direction and instruction of Roosevelt, and the money sent to New York to accommodate his friends, Morgan, Gary, and Perkins. Do the American people know that?

IMPORTANCE OF THE PUJO MONEY TRUST BILL PENDING IN THE SENATE.

I promise you gentlemen if the Senate will pass that bill and allow the power to go into the records of the institutions of these gentlemen in New York and elsewhere, we will unearth things that will make the American voters rise up and call the Democratic Congress blessed. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They are fighting the Pujo bill to the death in the Senate as a last desperate effort, because they know if the Money Trust investigating committee is given power to go into the records of those great financial institutions, *it is certain to be discovered the men to whom Morgan parceled out the people's money when Cortelyou took it to him in 1907, under Roosevelt's direction*, the purposes for which it was expended, and many acts of criminality on the part of that coterie of financiers. It would reveal a putrid condition of financial affairs on the part of those men, and that too in connection with the Government's funds, that would startle the civilized world. Hence the death grapple in the Senate now to stay the passage of that bill giving the people the right to examine the very creatures of the law, the great national banks. We of the South then will know how those gamblers manipulate the prices of cotton, and you in the West will understand how they send up and down the prices of your grain and cattle. And we will all learn how they have worked the stock markets, dislodged securities, and wrecked competitors and ruined their rivals throughout the length and breadth of this country. And that is the combination running this man Roosevelt before the American people to-day.

PROOF OF CONSPIRACY BETWEEN ROOSEVELT AND HARVESTER TRUST OFFICIALS—MORGAN, PERKINS, GARY, AND THE MCCORMICKS.

There is correspondence between the President, George W. Perkins, Herbert Knox Smith, and Mr. Strauss, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, which sets forth facts that every American should know covering up the affairs of the Harvester Trust. If those facts had been known in 1907 when the letters were written, impeachment proceedings would have been brought against the President and his Cabinet officer. For it is certain that he, Strauss, and Herbert Knox Smith deliberately entered into a conspiracy to violate the antitrust law and protect the International Harvester Co. Furthermore, criminal proceedings would have been instituted against Perkins and Gary and the McCormicks, if the facts had been known. Roosevelt was willing then for his friends—Perkins, Gary, and the McCormicks—to grind the farmers, whom he professes to love, with exorbitant charges for harvesters, reapers, and agricultural implements. He was cheerfully acquiescent in allowing the law to be violated daily, facts within his knowledge to be concealed from the public pointing to criminality, in order that "good trusts," as Herbert Knox Smith terms them, might fatten and feast upon the agricultural classes, because it was composed of his friends. He was willing to inclose "confidential" letters to his Attorney General not to prosecute the trust, which has since pleaded guilty to violating the law. May the people save the country from such a candidate. He wrote Mr. Bonaparte,

his Attorney General, "Do not prosecute that Harvester Trust organized by Perkins and Gary." He said to Mr. Strauss, his Cabinet officer, "You must not molest those men for violating the antitrust law." He called on this man, Herbert Knox Smith, for a report, and Smith sent it to him. Smith admits the trust. In this document sent by Smith it is proved they have violated the antitrust law, and Smith writes that it is a fact they are guilty of committing crime, but he maintains these men are great financiers and combined with Perkins and the Morgan interests. They tell Smith, he writes, "If you allow this prosecution, they are going to fight." Mr. Speaker, there never was a more scandalous and disgraceful document lodged in the archives of this country than this letter, and correspondence, dated April 24, 1912. It could not be gotten from the records of that department until the Senate commanded it, and then it came only after the second demand. It showed that Roosevelt, and Bonaparte, and Strauss, and Herbert Knox Smith knew of these violations of the law and they were covering up the criminal acts of Roosevelt's friends. Allow me to quote some parts of that telltale correspondence. It is deplorable that it can not go in full to the home of every voter in the land. Here are some excerpts. Herbert Knox Smith writes Roosevelt:

On January 18 and 19, 1907, Mr. Garfield and myself met at New York City Messrs. Gary, McCormick, Deering, and Perkins, all directors of the said company, and went over generally the subject matter of the company's organization and operation, receiving, so far as I know, absolutely frank and complete answers and further assurance of complete cooperation in carrying out the investigation.

Smith writes, referring to Perkins:

That, as he phrased it, he was now being laughed at in New York by the Standard Oil people, who were saying that he had tried to be good and keep solid with the administration, but that now he was going to get the same dose as other people who had not followed such policy. He concluded with great emphasis with the remark that if, after all the endeavors of this company and the other Morgan interests to uphold the policy of the administration and to adopt their methods of modern publicity, this company was now to be attacked in a purely technical case, the interests he represented were "going to fight."

This case raises the question included in what the President has called "good and bad trusts"; the question whether mere combination, as such, shall be prohibited; whether the Government is going to try to forbid all combinations regardless of their methods or ends, or whether, on the other hand, it is going to pursue the policy, frequently stated by the President, of regulation and control rather than of prohibition.

Smith comments:

I believe that industrial combination is an economic necessity, that the Sherman law, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, is an economic absurdity and is impossible of general enforcement, and even if partially enforced, will, in most cases, work only evil. I believe the principle it represents must ultimately be abandoned; that combination must be allowed and then regulated, and that the best means of regulation is by publicity, aided by the action of the Department of Justice and of the courts in case of proven violation of the interstate-commerce laws and other laws which deal with unfair methods of business.

Here he shows his contempt for the Supreme Court and the law and advocates open defiance to serve the trusts.

He here states the essence of the conspiracy between the President, Perkins, the Morgan interests, and the Harvester Trust officials:

While the administration has never hesitated to grapple with any financial interest, no matter how great, when it is believed that a substantial wrong is being committed, nevertheless, it is a very practical question whether it is well to throw away now the great influence of the so-called Morgan interests, which up to this time have supported the advanced policy of the administration, both in the general principles and in the application thereof to their specific interests, and to place them generally in opposition.

A careful study of this document will prove that Roosevelt was studiously protecting and cautiously concealing the misdeeds of his friends who are now financing this campaign for him.

See the "confidential" letter from Loeb to show his secretiveness:

OYSTER BAY, N. Y., September 24, 1907.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The President directs me to send you, for your confidential reading, the inclosed letters from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor and the Commissioner of Corporations concerning the Harvester Trust.

Very truly, yours,

WM. LOEB, JR.,
Secretary to the President.

HON. CHARLES J. BONAPARTE, Attorney General.

The document shows that Morgan and Perkins were backing all these interests. The people were not satisfied; they demanded investigation. They said this trust that Roosevelt protected must be prosecuted. And it was investigated, and the trust threw up its hands and said, "We are guilty of violating the law and will dissolve." We can no longer be protected, because we have defied the law." The present Attorney General is now endeavoring to agree upon a decree of dissolution. And these men have confessed they are guilty. They had to do it

after they were exposed. I make no attack on Roosevelt, but shall let the record condemn him. There it is. Read the Senate document and put it in the hands of the American voters, and they will wonder why there were not impeachment proceedings and why these things did not leak out. And this Harvester Trust covered up by these men has at last been run to cover; they have surrendered and now are dissolving. And these same men—Perkins and Morgan and the McCormicks—who financed them and were sponsors for that trust are the men who are sponsoring Roosevelt in this contest. And I want to say in simple justice to that brave Democrat, that knightly gentleman, that courageous man, and his coworkers on his committee, the Hon. A. O. STANLEY, of Kentucky, that it was by his investigation of the Steel Trust that the prosecution was forced. They uncovered this felony and laid it bare before the American people, and the Attorney General was compelled to bring suit. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Am I unfair when I make that statement? Is it not a fact? Did not Theodore say in Massachusetts, "Yes, Perkins is my friend, and I do not deny him; I always acknowledge my friends." Ah, he is more than a friend. He has tried clandestinely to be his savior in this contest. He is his faithful ally.

TAFT—HIS BROKEN PROMISES.

What can I say of Mr. Taft? What should be said of him? It does seem harsh, indeed, to speak in uncomplimentary terms of one almost politically dead. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Let me examine two or three salient points in Mr. Taft's record and study their significance. He said in Milwaukee before the election four years ago:

It is my judgment that a revision of the tariff in accordance with the pledge of the Republican platform will be, on the whole, a substantial revision downward, though there will probably be a few exceptions in this regard.

He promised a revision downward. He went into office on that speech; the voters believed him; but since he became President the Democrats reduced the tariff, schedule after schedule, and sent the bills to him, only to meet his veto with pledges broken. Why? Because he is helpless to do anything else. He stood with the men who are the beneficiaries through the protective tariff and could not keep his word. In some of his speeches he said he had to veto the bills for the sake of "party solidarity." Has it come to this that any President will sacrifice his whole country for party solidarity, and especially the solidarity of the present Republican party? Where is his party solidarity now? Roosevelt after him from one direction and the people from the other, the Republican Party is hopelessly divided because it broke its word of promise. Then he said:

With respect to the wool schedule, I agree that it is too high and that it ought to have been reduced. I am not saying that the tariff does not increase prices in clothing and in building and in other items that enter into the necessities of life.

He admits that the tariff is too high, and yet, when Congress reduces it and sends reduction bills to him, he vetoes them. And when we send the reduction bills now pending to him, we are informed by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that he will also veto them. He admits that the records of the Treasury Department for the year 1911 show that the wool duties under the Payne law range from 61 per cent to 157 per cent. The protective duties are enormous and out of all reason. The President knows and admits it, and yet will not and can not yield relief to the oppressed masses through Executive approval of our measures. If he is determined to veto all reductions of the tariff taking the burdens off the backs of the people, when will he be able to shake himself loose from special privileged classes and those who are seeking favors at the hands of the Government? In God's name, when the strike investigation revealed that children are starving and crying for bread in Lawrence, Mass.; when they are without clothing; when they are forced to drink unwholesome water from the factories and pay 5 and 10 cents a week for it, living on starvation wages; when factory hands, heads of families with families of six and seven are getting \$6 and \$7 per week, the wool trust protected with duties ranging all the way from 60 per cent to 180 per cent, when will the President sanction the reduction of those burdens? He is willing to witness the squalor and suffering, all those hideous things brought by that investigation to his very eyes which aroused the sympathy of the good women of the country as they flocked by the hundreds to hear the statements of those factory workers who have been ground to the dust by the protected industries and the American Woolen Trust. And yet Mr. Taft stands with them and against those who toil in this Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.] His acceptance speech at the White House the other day indicated that he has taken the back track, which means he knows the people have forsaken him, and now he throws himself into

the embraces of those who control frenzied finances and "big business" and establishes himself again in that speech as the candidate of the special interests and so-called big business.

In contrast with him to-day as the President who has broken his sacred avowal of tariff reduction to the people in order that he still might bask in the smiles of the protective-tariff favorites fattening through the instrumentality of the Government out of the pockets of the great masses of the overburdened public, we present to the country Woodrow Wilson, who never broke a pledge and with an unchallenged record of every promise to the people faithfully redeemed.

The Republican Party talks about government by injunction, and yet Mr. Taft is the father of government by injunction. Never has he done a thing to show his friendship to labor. Let me refer you to two of his decisions when he was a circuit judge. In the case of the Toledo A. A. & M. M. Railway Co. v. The Pennsylvania Co. (54 Fed. Rep., Apr. 13, 1903), you will find his sympathies were all with what is called "big business" and against the men who toll in the factories, in the mines, and on the railroads. Read the decision delivered on July 13, 1894, when Mr. Taft was a Federal judge. He showed his contempt for the rights of labor under the Constitution. He dragged far away from his home Frank W. Phelan and imprisoned him in the county jail of Warren County, Ohio, for six months without the poor privilege of being tried by a jury of his peers. He thus exemplified his antipathy to the rights of labor and became the father of government by injunction. The case is styled *Thomas v. The Cincinnati N. O. & T. P. R. R. Co.* (62 Fed. Rep.), and throws a flood of light upon the temperament and tendencies of Mr. Taft. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentleman, I shall not occupy your time now with the recital, but shall place in the RECORD the achievements of the Democratic Party in this Congress under the wise guidance of the great Speaker of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and other prominent Democrats. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I submit that this is an enviable record of achievement and constructive capacity on the part of the Democratic Party.

A PART OF THE DEMOCRATIC RECORD OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

1. A bill prohibits dealing in cotton futures.
2. A bill limits to eight hours the daily service of laborers and mechanics employed on Government work.
3. We have passed various tariff bills revising the wool, cotton, steel, and chemical schedules, and a farmers' and laborers' free-list bill, giving free farming implements, free cotton bagging and ties, and free meat and bread to the American people.
4. Amended the rules of the House and eliminated Cannonism by providing for the election of committees by the membership of the House.
5. Provided for a parcels post and governmental aid for public roads.
6. A bill authorizes the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton.
7. A bill provides for levying an excise tax on incomes.
8. A bill creates a department of labor.
9. A bill provides for publicity of contributions and expenditures for the purpose of influencing the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President.
10. A bill protects American trade and shipping from domestic and foreign monopolies.
11. A bill gives the accused the right of trial by jury in cases of indirect contempt.
12. A bill limits the power of Federal judges in the issuance of writs of injunction.
13. A joint resolution submits to the States an amendment to the Federal Constitution that United States Senators shall be elected directly by the people.
14. A bill provides for free sugar.
15. The House has authorized and directed investigations of the Steel Trust, the Beef Trust, the Shipping Trust, and the Money Trust.
16. We have passed bills for the better protection of life at sea.
17. Admitted Arizona and New Mexico to statehood.
18. Passed a bill abrogating the Russian treaty of citizenship.
19. We have passed at this session a bill creating a commission to investigate industrial conditions, and will pass a bill to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges in the several States.
20. We have passed the seamen's wage bill in behalf of labor and a righteous measure.

Thus we present a part of the record to the country. Who would undo it? It has been said that the Democratic Party is one of negation and not of constructive statesmanship. And

yet I assert here to-day that within less than two years Democracy has passed through the House more measures of benefit to the people of America than the Republican Party has given them since the conclusion of the Civil War. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Some have asserted that the Democratic Party is not constructive, but I assert that if the voters will reinvest us with power, if they will elect a Democratic Senate, and give the country New Jersey's great governor for President, we will redeem every pledge and bring relief to the people that they have not known during the last half century.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party is a constructive party. Its birth was coeval with that of the Republic. It sprang into life with the Constitution. We have won contests and we have lost some, but during all those conflicts our party has been representing the people's cause. Democracy is destined to live while liberty is loved and constitutional government is cherished. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We have seen other parties go to defeat. We have witnessed them dissolve and pass from the scenes of action, as the Republican Party is now dissolving. And still Democracy abides with us as the party of representative government and the hope of the masses. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We know, we assert, and the people shall know, that we are representing their cause in this contest. We charge that both the candidates of the Republican Party are fighting for the few, the few who would put their hands into the pockets of the masses and fatten at their expense. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That they stand for the principle that would build a high protective-tariff system, establish monopolies, and oppress the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to add in conclusion that if Gov. Wilson and his party are not fighting the cause of the people in this great conflict, the greatest political battle since the beginning of this Government, we are not entitled to win. If Democracy wavers in this crisis, it does not deserve to triumph and has no right to live. Standing in my place to-day as a Representative of the people, I say with all the fervor of my soul that Democracy carries the unsullied banner of the people's cause, and when this conflict is ended will again have earned the right to their enduring confidence. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

STEEL TRUST INVESTIGATION.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at 11 o'clock, the House proceed to the discussion of the report (H. Rept. 1127) of the committee investigating the affairs of the United States Steel Corporation—from 11 o'clock in the morning to 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

The SPEAKER. As a matter of fact, the House meets without special agreement at 12 o'clock.

Mr. STANLEY. Then, I move that the House meet on that day at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], as a part of his request, asks that when the House adjourns next Wednesday it adjourn to meet on Thursday at 11 o'clock, and immediately after the reading of the Journal it shall proceed to the discussion of the report on the Steel Trust, and continue from 11 o'clock until 5 o'clock, and have a night session from 8 o'clock until 11.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am glad and anxious for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] to have the opportunity to discuss this important matter; but in the condition of public business at this time I do not think that any arrangements for unanimous consent should be agreed to without the reservation that they shall not conflict with appropriation bills and conference reports.

Mr. STANLEY. I accept that reservation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], so far as he is concerned, accepts that amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think, in the present state of public business in the House and in Congress, that there ought to be any agreement to set aside a day a week ahead for the consideration for any proposition. When Wednesday comes, if the state of business is such that the House can use Thursday for debate on the steel investigation, I shall be very glad to have it done and will make no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. MANN. I shall have to object.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, in to-day's issue of the Washington Post is an article on the situation relative to the pension appropriation bill, and in it is this passage:

SENATOR McCUMBER EXPLAINS.

Prompt passage of the pension bill was predicted last night by Senator McCUMBER, who declared that the abandonment of the pension agencies, as proposed by the House and opposed by the Senate, would be a false economy.

"The pensions have been held up chiefly because of the absence from the city of two members of the joint committee," Senator McCUMBER stated last night. "They are Representative WILLIAM P. BORLAND, of Missouri, and Representative CHARLES L. BARTLETT, of Georgia. But a settlement will soon be reached, and I believe that the appropriation will be passed either Monday or early next week, making the entire \$165,000,000 available.

This purported statement is so grossly unjust, so manifestly unfair, and so lacking in every element of truth that I know that Senator McCUMBER never uttered it. But if those who read it are not familiar with the facts, it is important, in justice to these two gentlemen, as well as to this House, that the facts be stated.

The House passed the pension appropriation bill (H. R. 18985) on the 2d of February. It passed the Senate on the 30th of May. The House disagreed to the Senate amendments on the 1st of June. The Senate insisted upon its amendments on the 4th of June and asked for a conference. Since that time, as I am reliably informed from different sources, the managers upon the part of the House have been going back and forth to the Senate, endeavoring to reach some agreement upon this bill, and have been treated with a contempt and a discourtesy that, in my opinion, would have justified the raising of a question involving the privileges of the House.

A gentleman in charge of this bill in one instance received a note requesting him to attend a conference at the place usually fixed, and when he arrived there, he was informed that he could not see the Senator in charge of the conference on behalf of the other body and was denied admission to the room. He was permitted to talk to a clerk of the Senate. My information is that the managers upon the part of the House, although frequently, day after day, seeking an opportunity to confer with the Senators, have never been able to meet with them more than about four times. Finally the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], despairing of getting any agreement whatever upon any item in the pension appropriation bill, left the city because of important business. At my suggestion the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] communicated to the Senators that unless they were willing either to make an agreement upon the amendments or to report a disagreement to the Senate, he would take advantage of the first opportunity that occurred in the House to state to the House what the situation was and why no agreement could be reached. And finally, upon the 25th day of July, after a number of suggestions of various kinds had been offered by the House, the Senate representatives were induced to sign a report of disagreement. Every amendment in the pension appropriation bill proposed by the Senate was speedily acquiesced in by the Representatives of the House, excepting those which the Senate added providing for the abolishment of 17 useless pension agencies. The conference report was signed on the 25th of July. It was presented to the House on that day by the gentlemen in charge of the conference on the part of the House. It has never seen the light of day in the Senate. Under the rules of procedure action must be taken first in the Senate, and until the gentleman at the other end of the Capitol who has that conference report stowed securely either in his pocket or some secluded pigeonhole will consent to present it to the Senate, it is impossible for any action to be taken.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Where are the original papers?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The original papers are practically in my possession. They have never left the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. How can the Senate act upon the conference report without having the original papers?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman knows that the Senate is entitled to the possession of the papers and will have them if it desires. If no one will raise the question as to our right to proceed I shall very gladly call up the conference report to-day and determine on behalf of the House what shall be done. The Senate can then determine whether it will deprive deserving and needy soldiers of their pension within the next few days simply from a desire to retain 17 offices at an expense of \$200,000 a year which, since 1885, efforts have been made to abolish.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly; but, first, let me say one thing further about the possession of the papers. It is not due

to any fault or trick on behalf of the House, but apparently the Senate did not desire the papers.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from New York knows that the rules of the Senate with reference to conference reports are unlike the rules of the House, in that they do not require the conference report to be printed before it is agreed to by the Senate. The gentleman further knows that neither body can act on a conference report without having the original papers in its possession. Now, how can the Senate conferees present their conference report and ask for its consideration, which is the practice in the Senate, unless they have possession of the papers which have not yet been turned over to them? May it not be a matter of misunderstanding?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman need not be alarmed about that situation. The papers are safely put away awaiting the request of the Senate for them and an indication that it really desires them and will take care of them and not lose them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, on the 4th of August a very large number of pensions should be paid. The bill as it passed the House carried \$152,000,000 for the payment of pensions during the current year. The Senate adopted an amendment increasing the amount to \$164,500,000, and the conferees on the part of the House accepted that amendment. Under the resolution adopted on the 1st of July one-twelfth of \$152,000,000 was made available for the payment of pensions during the month of July. Under the resolution adopted on the 1st of August one twenty-fourth of \$152,000,000 was made available on the 1st of August for the payment of pensions during the month of August. As nearly as I can ascertain it will require about \$15,000,000 to pay the pensions—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for 10 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks that his time be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. As I was saying, it will require about \$15,000,000 to meet the obligations. About \$6,500,000 will be available, and about \$9,000,000 additional will be required. Senator McCUMBER introduced a joint resolution in the Senate on the 1st of August which recites that owing to a disagreement between the two Houses the appropriations for pensions have not been made. "Whereas," the resolution reads, "it is probable that some considerable time will elapse before an agreement shall be reached upon said bill"—somewhat inconsistent with the statement purported to have been uttered by the Senator to-day or last night that there would be an agreement by Monday or Tuesday. Whereas about \$30,000,000 will be needed, it proposes to appropriate \$30,000,000 for the payment of these pensions.

Mr. Speaker, prior to 1885 pension agents were paid by fees, and they were among the most lucrative offices in the gift of the entire Government. In 1885 the House of Representatives, which was then Democratic, passed a pension appropriation bill with a provision reducing the number of agents to 12 and specifically fixing their compensation at \$4,000 a year. The Senate, which was Republican—a similar situation to that of to-day—increased the number of pension agents to 18 and assented to the salary of \$4,000 a year.

During the Sixtieth and Sixty-first Congresses, in 1908, 1909, 1910, and 1911, the Republican House of Representatives passed in the appropriation bill provisions providing for the abolition of these offices. At this session of Congress we voted to abolish these offices. In the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union there were 107 votes in favor and 16 votes against the proposition, and the bill was passed with a record vote of 243 ayes and 33 noes. In the last Congress the managers on the part of the House were the gentleman from Ohio, Gen. Kefauver, and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Gardner, both of whom served with great distinction in the Civil War, and both of whom unquestionably had at heart the interests of the old soldiers, believed that the continuance of these pension agents was indefensible, particularly as the Commissioner of Pensions had stated before the Committee on Appropriations the only excuse for their continuation was to provide 17 places at \$4,000 for deserving persons.

Mr. Speaker, many attempts have been made, as I have pointed out, to get rid of these useless offices. On the 6th of February, 1897, President Cleveland by Executive order reduced the number to nine, to take effect December 1, 1897. On the 14th of July of the same year President McKinley issued an order suspending the consolidation of the agencies. I do not intend to say anything in criticism of President McKinley, because I am convinced from my investigation of this matter

that unless by positive legislation these agencies be abolished the pressure for the places will be so great that it is practically impossible for the President to execute the power he has under the statute to consolidate them.

I have received during this session of Congress a large number of resolutions from Grand Army posts protesting against the continuation of these agencies and stating that the men who served in the Civil War have no desire that money be squandered uselessly in this way, but that whatever is chargeable against the pension roll shall be paid to the deserving soldiers who are entitled to their pensions.

It has been said that this has not been recommended officially; that it is simply a desire to make a showing. Without taking the time of the House, I shall ask permission to append to my remarks the statements made by the various Commissioners of Pensions every year since 1906 before the Committee on Appropriations, showing that these agencies should be abolished, as well as the report of the Secretary of the Interior in 1907, showing that there would be an increased efficiency in the payment of the pensions and the elimination of every possible delay, and that there would be an actual saving of \$200,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, we are face to face with this situation: The House has accepted and is willing to agree to all of the Senate amendments providing the money necessary to pay the pensions due to the soldiers. It has declined to appropriate or to countenance a continuation of unnecessary, useless offices. If there be delay or inconvenience to the old soldier in the payment of the pensions within the next few days, it is due to the fact that the Senate, because of the interest of a few Senators, who imagine that their political fortunes will be advanced by the retention of these agencies, decline to consent to the abolition of useless agencies. This is not a partisan question in this House. Both sides of the House have acquiesced in this movement. The House, when under the control of both parties, has recommended that these agencies be abolished, and it has done whatever is possible to abolish them. The conferee from that side of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], I am informed, is in accord with the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Missouri; and I think it is not only unfortunate but grossly unjust, when whatever delay may be occasioned from the failure to pay these pensions is due to the greed of a few men desiring to retain useless offices, that an attempt should be made to attribute it to the absence of gentlemen who were not only here but who exerted everything in their power and exercised the patience of Job in the attempt to adjust the differences between the two Houses.

I wish the House and the country to know that if there be any inconvenience, if there be any delay, the responsibility for it is not upon the House, not upon Members upon either side of the House, but that it belongs at the other end of the Capitol. If that branch of the Legislature desires to take the responsibility for delaying and preventing these pensions being paid in order to protect political appointees, it must take it with the knowledge of the facts in possession of the country. [Applause.]

On January 19, 1906, this transpired in the Committee on Appropriations:

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I would like to ask the commissioner what is the necessity of having 18 pension agencies.

Mr. WARNER—

Who was then Commissioner of Pensions—

None whatever. They should be reduced to six. That could be done by an Executive order.

Commissioner Warner said later:

If I had the power, I would decrease the number of agencies in the United States to six.

Mr. KEIFER. Who can do that?

Mr. WARNER. The President can do it by an Executive order.

On January 17, 1907, Mr. Warner, Commissioner of Pensions, was before the Committee on Appropriations, and speaking of the work of his bureau, he said:

I have no complaint to make of the organization, or laws, or anything else, so far as that is concerned. There is only one point; that is the question of the agencies for the payment of pensions throughout the United States. That is within the control of the President, as to the number of them. There are now 18, and I think it would be good policy to reduce the number to 9, anyway.

Mr. GARDNER. Have you any recommendation to make in that respect?

Mr. WARNER. It is entirely within the control of the President. I recommend that the number be reduced from 18 to 9, but of course it is an embarrassing proposition. There are 18 agents, at \$4,000 salary each, scattered around over the United States, and Senators and Representatives are interested in them, etc. You do not have to tell a Member of Congress what that means. I think it would be economy in policy to reduce the number to 9. It could be reduced to 6.

Mr. BROWNLOW. Do you think that would improve the efficiency of the service?

Mr. WARNER. I think it would benefit the efficiency of the service, because you can do business better with 1 man than with 3, and you can do business better with 9 than with 18 agencies. You can enforce policies better with 9 than 18. The checks and vouchers would be made

all the same then. As it is now we have separate checks for each agency with the agent's name printed in them and a separate voucher for each agency.

On January 27, 1908, Commissioner Warner said:

As far as I personally am concerned it would be better for me if the agencies should remain just as they are, as their consolidation would make me additional responsibility and labor. But looking at it from a business point of view and as if it were my own business, I would consolidate them instantly, or as soon as it could be done. It would be more economical for the Government and it would work better than to have these agencies scattered all over the country. The work would go smoother, mistakes could be corrected more quickly, information obtained at once, and the record kept in better shape.

On January 7, 1909:

Mr. KEIFER. On page 5 is the item for the salaries of 18 agents for the payment of pensions, at \$4,000 each, \$72,000. That would be the same as before?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. I wish you could knock them down to 9.

Mr. BOWERS. I think it ought to be done.

Mr. WARNER. You would do it in a moment if it was your own business. You take New Hampshire and Maine and Massachusetts—three little agencies up there that would not make a vest pocketful, hardly.

On February 5, 1910:

Mr. KEIFER. If you care to state, will you please say whether you think it would be advisable to pay all of these pensions at one agency from Washington?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I think it would be in the interest of economy.

Mr. KEIFER. Have you made any calculations as to what would be the approximate saving of money if they were all paid from one agency?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I have not the figures before me, but I think we would save about \$200,000.

In the report of the Secretary of the Interior, dated December 31, 1907, he says:

A special report, House Document No. 352, Sixtieth Congress, first session, has been made to Congress on the advisability of discontinuing all the agencies except the one in Washington. In the present condition of the roll this change would effect an immediate saving of approximately \$200,000 a year, and there would be no loss in the efficiency of the service and in the promptness of payment to the pensioners.

PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF PENSION AGENCIES.

Letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a report in relation to the proposed reduction in the number of the pension agencies:

SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1907.

SIR: The "act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1907, contained the following proviso:

"Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior shall make inquiry and report to Congress, at the beginning of its next regular session, the effect of a reduction of the present pension agencies to one such agency upon the economic execution of the pension laws, the prompt and efficient payment of pensioners, and the inconvenience to pensioners, if any, which would result from such reduction. This provision shall not be construed as interfering with or limiting the right or power of the President under existing law in respect to reduction or consolidation of existing pension agencies."

In compliance with said provision I submit herewith the following report:

1. Economic execution of pension laws: The annual expenditure on account of the payment of pensions, including the salaries of pension agents, clerk hire, contingent expenses, and the printing of vouchers and checks, is approximately \$550,000, an average cost per pensioner of 55 cents per annum. It is estimated that after a consolidation has been completed and in perfect working order, all pensioners could be paid by the Commissioner of Pensions or one disbursing officer, located in the city of Washington, with an annual expenditure of, at most, \$350,000, a saving of 20 cents per annum per pensioner, or \$200,000. After the first year of the consolidation, I am of the opinion that the appropriation for the expense of paying pensions could be safely reduced at least \$25,000 more.

2. The prompt and efficient payment of pensioners: If all pensioners are paid by the Commissioner of Pensions, or one disbursing officer, provision should be made for a division of the pensioners into three groups, one group to be paid each month, as at present, and all pensioners could be paid as promptly by the Commissioner of Pensions, or one disbursing officer, as by 18 agents.

3. Inconvenience to pensioners: As all pensioners could be paid as promptly by the Commissioner of Pensions, or one disbursing officer, as by 18 agents, there would be no inconvenience to pensioners except the slight delay which would be caused in the case of pensioners living remote from Washington in the time required for a voucher to reach Washington through the mails and for the check to be returned. The checks would, however, be issued quarterly as now and the pensioner receive his payment regularly every three months after the receipt of the first payment. Many of the pensioners now paid by the San Francisco agency do not receive their checks until seven or eight days have expired from the date of mailing of vouchers. Pensioners now living in Montana, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, who are now paid by the San Francisco agency, would experience but a slight delay in receipt of their checks if paid in this city. In this connection attention is invited to the fact that there are 52,201 pensioners in the agency district paid by San Francisco. More than 10,000 of these pensioners are now being paid by other agencies, and there is no complaint of delay in receiving payment. All Navy pensioners residing in the Southern States are now paid by the Washington agency, and there is no complaint about delay in payment. There are 26,448 pensioners residing in the State of California. Of this number nearly 5,000 are not paid by the San Francisco agency, but are paid by other agencies.

There are certain other conditions to which attention should be invited if all pensions should be paid by the Commissioner of Pensions, or one central disbursing officer located in this city. The records would be readily accessible for reference by the bureau. A large amount of extra correspondence is now required to furnish information to correspondents relative to the payment of pensions. The bureau must first

obtain such information from the pension agents, and a great deal of time is consumed in securing this information, especially from agencies located in distant cities.

All vouchers now required by pensioners are printed by the Government Printing Office in this city and forwarded to the different pension agents, there to be prepared and mailed to the pensioner with checks for the preceding quarter. All checks now used by the pension agents are likewise printed in this city. A considerable saving would result in the cost of printing vouchers and also in the cost of printing checks if such vouchers and checks were prepared for 1 agency rather than for 18.

All paid vouchers must be forwarded by the pension agents to the Auditor for the Interior Department in this city. There is always danger of the loss of such vouchers in the mails. Many vouchers of widows pensioners under the general law and under the act of June 27, 1890, were recently lost in transit from one of the pension agencies to the auditor in this city. No trace of the missing vouchers has as yet been discovered. The pension agent has since died, and his accounts can not be settled for many months on account of the lost vouchers.

It is further suggested that if it be decided to consolidate the 18 agencies into one agency the entire 18 agencies be abolished and provision be made that the payments be made by the Commissioner of Pensions or one disbursing officer, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The statute now provides (26 Stat. L., 138) that the pension agent, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, may designate and authorize a clerk to sign the name of the pension agent to official checks. There are 18 such designated clerks now employed, one at each agency. The name of the pension agent is printed on all checks used, but before the check is issued it must be countersigned by the designated clerk. Only one clerk may be thus authorized to sign such checks for any one pension agent under the law as it now stands. If all pensioners were paid by the Commissioner of Pensions or by one disbursing officer the services of six or eight clerks would be required to sign such checks, and if the 18 agencies be abolished and all payments made by the Commissioner of Pensions or one disbursing officer provision should be made authorizing the Commissioner of Pensions or the disbursing officer, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to designate the necessary number of clerks to sign the name of the Commissioner of Pensions or disbursing officer to such official checks.

Ample accommodation for the consolidated agency could be furnished in the Pension Building.

Under the practice now in vogue there is a duplication of records. Each of the 18 agents receives from here the certificates of pensions for the pensioners residing in his district. A record is made here and also by the agent at the agency, who then forwards the certificate with the voucher to the pensioner. A consolidation of the agencies would require but one record of the certificate, etc., which would be kept in the office here in Washington, and the certificate and voucher would be mailed direct to the pensioner from here. This would do away with having the certificate mailed to the agent, the making of a record by the agent, and the mailing by him of the certificate and voucher to the pensioner.

It would seem that the law should leave to the discretion of the commissioner and the Secretary as to when the transfers from the different agencies should be made. To require all of such transfers to be made on one date would entail unnecessary work and might result in delay and complications in making payments.

If the 18 agencies are abolished and provision made for the payment of all pensions from the city of Washington, I respectfully suggest that an appropriation of at least \$10,000 should be made, to be immediately available, for the purpose of carrying out the consolidation and defraying the necessary expenses of the removal of the records, etc., of the agencies to the city of Washington.

Very respectfully,

JAMES RUDOLPH GARFIELD,
Secretary.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this disagreement between the House and the Senate, protracted beyond the beginning of this fiscal year, is most unfortunate. Like everything else, there are two sides to the question. I am willing that it should be settled either way. I think it entirely likely that it is equally as efficient and slightly more economical to settle it according to the contention of the House, but there are \$165,000,000 to be dispensed and, my friend says, \$200,000 to be saved if the disbursement is from the city of Washington rather than throughout the country from the various agencies. On the other hand, it is claimed—whether truly so or not is not necessary for me to discuss—that it is more economical to continue the former practice, that the clerks throughout the country get about half the pay they do in the Pension Office, without any leave of absence, that the clerks in Washington would receive. I shall not go into the merits of it. I say, again, I think it is most unfortunate, and I would be glad, if there is any feeling about the matter, if the Senate is entitled to the papers, to see them transmitted to the Senate if there has been an agreement upon all except one point, because they must have the papers. I suppose they are entitled to them as a matter of right, although I did not know, I will say to the gentleman from New York, that they did not have the papers, that being the matter that did not come directly under my observation.

Now, how much will it take to pay the pensions during August; I did not catch it exactly?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My information is about \$15,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. In addition?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; all told.

Mr. CANNON. And how much is the deficiency; how much are we short?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Six and a half millions available under the extension resolution.

Mr. CANNON. That would be eight and a half millions additional necessary to pay the pensions starting to-morrow, is that right?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Starting on the 4th of August.

Mr. CANNON. Now, there is a rule of this House and a rule between the two bodies where an irresistible force meets an immovable body that we proceed under those rules, namely, that legislation shall not be carried by an appropriation bill unless both the House and the Senate agree.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no such rule in this House; there may be one in the other.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I have found, and I fancy the gentleman has as well, when the Senate having insisted almost to the crack of doom on putting legislation upon appropriation bills that where the House has said we will not submit to legislation upon general appropriation bills that the Senate has been compelled to recede.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman understands this legislation is legislation designed to accomplish an administrative reform, and the House, being the guardian of the people's purse, has always insisted upon it.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; but it is legislation. Now, the Senate, if they invoke that rule and say they will not recede, there will be no legislation until the Senate does recede. In the meantime by misunderstanding, possibly by something of temper, something of insistence on the part of the House, and something of objection on the part of the Senate, there are eight and a half millions short of the necessary amount of money to pay the pensions to-morrow. Now, then, I fancy this matter, back and forth between the House and the Senate, will not be understood very much by the—how many—900,000 people who are upon the pension rolls.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I ask for two minutes more, if I can get it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that he may have five minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. I think that is more than I wish. I say again, I will not discuss the merits of this proposition between the House and the Senate, but I think that we would be justified, considering a further contention between an irresistible force and an immovable body that results in no legislation and no appropriation bill, I think I want to submit to the gentleman from New York if he will not ask unanimous consent as a member of the majority and as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to here and now pass a deficiency bill or a bill providing eight and a half million dollars to enable the 900,000 pensioners to be paid? [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it is a rule of legislative bodies that in passing any action in regard to a bill after the bill has been engrossed the House which acts upon it must be in physical possession of the papers, and the practice in reference to conference is this: This body disagreed to the Senate amendment and asked for a conference, sent a message to the Senate announcing that fact, and with the message the papers went also. The Senate agreed to the conference and sent a message to the House stating they had agreed to the conference, and with that message came the papers. The papers went into the hands, or should have gone into the hands, of the House conferees. The rule is that when an agreement is reached in conference the conferees having possession of the papers transfer them to the conferees of the other body, so that the body that asks for the conference is the body that acts last upon the conference report, and the body that agrees to the conference is the body that acts first upon the conference report. In this case, under this practice, it is the duty of the Senate to act first upon the conference report, and the papers should be in the hands of the Senate conferees. If there has been a conference report signed, when the conference report was signed the papers should have been delivered by the House conferees to the Senate conferees. I understand that that was not done. I think it should be done now. Now, Mr. Speaker, a word more.

I have been in favor for years of abolishing the pension agencies. I urged the conferees, when the Republicans were in a majority in the House, not to agree until the Senate receded from its amendment adding the pension agencies to the bill as it passed the House. And I still maintain that position. If it

is a question of stubbornness between the House and the Senate, I can be just as stubborn as anybody in the Senate can be. [Applause.] I do not believe that the House ought to recede from its position. [Applause.] My colleague from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] who has just addressed the House, has been on more conference committees and had more experience in conference work than any other Member of the House or the Senate, and I have the highest respect for his opinion. The rule that he states is undoubtedly the rule as to legislative matters or new propositions, but in this case it is a question whether we appropriate the money for 17 pension agencies or 1 pension agency. I think that the logic of the rule is that when the House declines to appropriate for more than 1 pension agency the Senate must recede from its demand to have 16 extra agencies appropriated for. [Applause.] If the Senate wants to stand responsible before the country for the lack of money with which to pay the pensions now due, that responsibility is on the Senate and not on the House. [Applause.] The House is prepared to increase the amount of money provided by the Senate amendments to the appropriation bill, but I think is not prepared to provide the 16 extra pension agencies. I hope that the gentleman in charge of the House conferees will deliver the papers to the Senate conferees and leave the responsibility with them if they delay the appropriation. [Applause.]

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bill of the following title:

On August 3, 1912:

H. R. 21480. An act to establish a standard barrel and standard grades for apples when packed in barrels, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18642) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909, and that the Senate had receded from its amendments numbered 3 and 4.

FRANCHISES GRANTED IN PORTO RICO (S. DOC. NO. 894).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered printed. Also the accompanying papers were referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, with instructions that they be not printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

As required by section 32 of the act of Congress approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith certified copies of franchises granted by the Executive Council of Porto Rico, which are described in the accompanying letter from the Secretary of War transmitting them to me. Such of these as relate to railroad, street railway, telegraph and telephone franchises, privileges or concessions have been approved by me, as required by the joint resolution of May 1, 1900 (31 Stat., 715).

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 3, 1912.

LAWS RELATIVE TO SEAMEN.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the bill H. R. 23673, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 23673) to abolish the involuntary servitude imposed upon seamen in the merchant marine of the United States while in foreign ports and the involuntary servitude imposed upon the seamen of the merchant marine of foreign countries while in ports of the United States, to prevent unskilled manning of American vessels, to encourage the training of boys in the American merchant marine, for the further protection of life at sea, and to amend the laws relative to seamen.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next section of the bill.

The Clerk proceeded to read.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question. I thought the Clerk commenced back on page 14.

The SPEAKER. The Chair's understanding was, although it may be wrong, that there were just two sections of this bill that had not been considered.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The Speaker is mistaken. There are several sections that have not been considered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Clerk should finish this section, and then we will return to section 12.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will finish reading this section. Section 12 was passed, the Chair will state to the gentleman, and we can return to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. What section is this?

The SPEAKER. Section 17, page 18. The Clerk will report the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 17. That this act shall take effect as to all vessels of the United States 90 days after its passage and as to foreign vessels 12 months after its passage, save and except that such parts hereof as provide for the abrogation of any stipulation by treaty or convention with any foreign nation shall only take effect after such notice and at the expiration of such time as may be required by the terms of such treaty stipulation or convention.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 13, by striking out the figures "17" and inserting in lieu thereof "16."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask now to return to section 12. I have two amendments to submit to the section.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have an amendment to this section if it is time for it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] to offer his first amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Clerk has the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] if his amendment was printed the other day in the RECORD?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; it was not. As I understand it, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] is offering an amendment to section 12, but I was offering an amendment to the section just read—the last section.

The SPEAKER. Where is the amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is on page 18.

The SPEAKER. But where is the physical property of the amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I sent it up to the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. This amendment is to the section just read, which is now section 16?

Mr. MANN. Not yet.

The SPEAKER. Yes, it is, because the Chair put that amendment and it was carried. Nobody objected to it. The Clerk will now report the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 9, strike out all after the word "vessel" and all of lines 10, 11, and 12 and insert:

"That all treaties of the United States with foreign nations, in so far as they require the arrest, or detention, or return to his ship of any American sailor for desertion, are hereby abrogated."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk informs the Chair that this amendment really applies to section 15 and not to section 16.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know what section it applies to, but I have read both of them. I gave the line and the page. That is the reason why I interrupted the reading.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment again.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the provision that the gentleman seeks to amend is on page 18, lines 10, 11, and 12.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. This section was not read before.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; it was read the other day.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If that is true, I offer the amendment, then, to the other section.

The SPEAKER. Where does the gentleman want it to come in?

Mr. MANN. It was passed over before.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It was passed over before, and it would be inserted on page 18, line 9, striking out all of line 9 after the word "vessel" and all of lines 10, 11, and 12 of page 18 and inserting that amendment. I desire to be heard on it just a moment, Mr. Speaker, in order to explain what is meant by it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, is it in order—the section already having been considered?

The SPEAKER. It can not be done except by unanimous consent. By unanimous consent it can be done.

Mr. MANN. The sections were passed over the other day.

The SPEAKER. The understanding of the Chair was that it had been passed over.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It was read the other day.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 18, line 9, by striking out all after the word "vessel" and all of lines 10, 11, and 12, and inserting: "That all treaties of the United States with foreign nations, in so far as they require the arrest or detention or return to his ship of any American sailor for desertion, are hereby abrogated."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to offer an amendment to the next section, and I ask to offer it now, so that both of them may be considered at the same time. They cover the same subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] asks to have pending another amendment for the purpose of considering both it and the other one together. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 18, by striking out section 16 and inserting the following: "That the President of the United States is hereby requested to enter into negotiations with all foreign nations with whom we have treaties upon the subject looking to the abrogation of all provisions in such treaties for the arrest and punishment of seamen for desertion, and also negotiations with such nations looking to the formation of treaties between this country and such other countries to improve the condition of seamen and to produce greater security for life and property at sea, and to report the result of such negotiations to Congress at the earliest convenient time."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Now, Mr. Speaker, the bill as it stands abrogates a large number of treaties; in fact, treaties that we have with every commercial nation of the world; and it does it without any notice, without asking them to enter into any negotiations.

It vitally affects our commercial relations in a great many ways, and the sole purpose of it is to do away with what they call the "imprisonment" of the sailor—that is, to keep him from being returned to his ship for desertion.

Now, I am perfectly willing that that portion of the treaty so far as it applies to American sailors should be abrogated without notice to foreign countries. I think we have a perfect right to say what we shall do with our own sailors without consulting other countries. But for us to abrogate these various treaties that we have with commercial nations without giving them any notice does not seem to me to be such action as this body ought to take. Nor do I believe it will hasten the final time of this bill's becoming law. I am satisfied that the Senate will not pass a bill absolutely abrogating these various treaties without some notice being given to foreign nations. I am also satisfied that the Department of Commerce and Labor would not approve the legislation in this form, nor do I believe for one moment that the President of the United States upon a matter so small as the abolishing of imprisonment for desertion, which affects only foreign sailors, would sign the bill abrogating those treaties without notice. Now, if we are going to free the foreign sailor—and that is all this does—if we are going to make him free, why not at least consult the country that keeps him in bondage, and the country that he is willing to serve? I think we are making progress, if we will take this plan and abrogate the treaties in so far as they affect American sailors, and then take up the negotiations with foreign countries in regard to their own sailors. That is all I have to say upon this amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the provision in the bill is that—

All treaties in conflict with this act are hereby abrogated, and the President of the United States is required at once to so notify every nation having any such treaty.

I am not familiar with the form of the treaties. The matter that would be in conflict with this provision would be in a commercial or navigation treaty, would it not?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. It would. We have commercial treaties with some 22 nations in which this question is involved.

Mr. MANN. Those treaties, I think, as a rule have provisions in reference to notice of abrogation.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. The time is usually one year. I do not know of any exception to that. But section 16 provides that this shall not go into effect until after the expiration of that notice, no matter how long notice may be required.

Mr. MANN. Where is that?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. That is in section 16:

That this act shall take effect, as to all vessels of the United States, 90 days after its passage, and as to foreign vessels 12 months after its passage, save and except that such parts hereof as provide for the abrogation of any stipulation by treaty or convention with any foreign nation shall only take effect after such notice, and at the expiration of such time as may be required by the terms of such treaty, stipulation, or convention.

Mr. MANN. I remember reading that, now. Does the gentleman think that absolutely covers the proposition?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I think it does, and I see no reason why the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] should be agreed to under these circumstances.

Mr. MANN. I did not catch the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington. I was looking at the provisions of the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. If there are any provisions of this bill that are in conflict with any of our treaty obligations, then it becomes the duty of the President to give notice of the abrogation of the treaty, whether it applies to deserting seamen or to any other particular phase of the bill. Then the bill itself, as to that particular phase, does not go into effect until the expiration of the time required by the treaty for notice to be given to the foreign government.

Mr. MANN. I think probably that covers it, although it seems to me rather an inartificial way of getting at it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The last two amendments were offered to the original section 16. I think the committee amendment changing the number of the section was not agreed to. That does not amount to anything, as the Clerk will do it anyhow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is mistaken. The gentleman happened to be engaged when the Chair put that amendment in this way: That if there was no objection the amendment changing the number of the section would be agreed to.

Mr. MANN. It would not make any difference anyway. I was only trying to identify it. Now, this section was passed over.

The SPEAKER. Section 12.

Mr. MANN. Section 15 was passed over the other day. Now, if we go back to section 12, does that dispose of section 15? In other words, if anybody has any other amendment, let him produce it now.

The SPEAKER. If any gentleman has any amendment to section 15 let him offer it.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Or forever after hold his peace.

The SPEAKER. If not, we will return to section 12. The Clerk will read section 12.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 12. That no vessel, except those navigating rivers exclusively and except as provided in section 1 of this act, shall be permitted to depart from any port of the United States unless she has on board a crew not less than 75 per cent of which, in each department thereof, are able to understand any order given by the officers of such vessel, nor unless 40 per cent in the first year, 45 per cent in the second year, 50 per cent in the third year, 55 per cent in the fourth year after the passage of this act, and thereafter 65 per cent of her deck crew, exclusive of licensed officers, are of a rating not less than able seaman: *Provided*, That no vessel carrying passengers, except those navigating rivers and harbors exclusively, shall be permitted to depart from any port of the United States unless she shall have a sufficient crew to man each lifeboat with not less than two men of the rating of able seaman or higher.

No person shall be rated as an able seaman unless he is 19 years of age or upward and has had at least three years service on deck at sea or on the Great Lakes. Any person may make application to any board of local inspectors for a certificate of service as able seaman, and upon proof being made to said board by affidavit, under rule approved by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, showing the nationality of the applicant and the vessel or vessels on which he has had service and that he has had at least three years service on deck at sea or on the Great Lakes, the board of local inspectors shall issue to said applicant a certificate of service, which shall be retained by him and be accepted as prima facie evidence of his rating as an able seaman.

Each board of local inspectors shall keep a complete record of all certificates of service issued by them and to whom issued and shall keep on file the affidavits upon which said certificates are issued.

The collector of customs may, upon his own motion, and shall, upon the sworn information of any citizen of the United States setting forth that this section is not being complied with, cause a muster of the crew of any vessel to be made to determine the fact; and no clearance shall be given to any vessel failing to comply with the provisions of this section.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Clerk report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of line 14, page 15, the words "who shall be drilled in the handling and lowering of lifeboats under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the amendment provides that those who are charged with maintaining the lifeboats shall be drilled in the handling and lowering of the lifeboats under rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. It is not necessary to detain the House by discussing the merits of this amendment. The *Titanic* disaster developed that there were not sufficient men to man the lifeboats, and that they were wanting in skill. This amendment is to charge the officers of the vessel with the duty of drilling these men in the lowering and handling of lifeboats, so that they may be available when accidents occur.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 17, strike out the words "on deck," after the words "Great Lakes," and insert the following: "Or as a fisherman, and upon examination by the local inspector, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Navigation, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, shall direct, shall satisfy such inspector that he is competent to handle a lifeboat and other craft and equipment used for saving life at sea."

Mr. ALEXANDER. That amendment does not relate to the same part of the section as my amendment, and is not now in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think that takes the place of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. I want to be heard on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Which amendment does the gentleman wish to be heard upon?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. On the substitute.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Missouri raises the point of order that the substitute is not germane, or that it does not appertain to the amendment offered by him.

Mr. ALEXANDER. He can offer his amendment after this is disposed of.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, it is exactly for the same purpose that I offer mine.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It relates to a different paragraph of the bill and is not inconsistent.

The SPEAKER. These two amendments have nothing on earth to do with each other. The amendment of the gentleman from Missouri comes in at the end of line 14 and reads:

Add at the end of line 14, page 15, "who shall be drilled in the handling and lowering of lifeboats under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors, to be approved by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor—"

and the amendment of the gentleman from Washington comes in after the word "deck," in line 17:

Or as a fisherman, and upon examination by the local inspector, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Navigation, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, shall direct, etc.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I now offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "section," in line 14, page 16, add the following words: "Provided, That the collector of customs shall not be required to cause such muster of the crew to be made unless said sworn information has been filed with him for at least six hours before the vessel departs, or is scheduled to depart."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri, in connection with this matter, whether he proposes to offer any amendment to the first part of that section, where it provides that the collector shall upon sworn information do certain things?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment printed in the RECORD and suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], which I do not care to offer myself, but my amendment was to meet the criticism that it would place too much power in the hands of one individual to cause a muster of the crew, because he might do it for vexatious purposes and to delay the sailing of the vessel. My amendment provides that the collector shall have the discretion to order the muster, and he shall not be required to do it unless the affidavit is filed at least six hours before the vessel departs or is scheduled to depart.

Mr. MANN. I failed to get that part of it that gave him any discretion.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Oh, he has a discretion, unless the affidavit is made at least six hours before the vessel is scheduled to depart.

Mr. MANN. The first part of the paragraph provides:

The collector of customs may, upon his own motion, and shall, upon the sworn information of any citizen of the United States, etc.

If it should read:

May upon his own motion or upon the sworn information of any citizen of the United States—

That would leave him discretion, without anything further, and it seems to me would cover the case even better than the gentleman has covered it.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. That would give him discretion without limiting it as to time. The amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Missouri gives him discretion if the affidavit is not filed six hours prior to the sailing of the vessel, and my opinion is that six hours' time would be sufficient in which to muster the crew of the largest vessel that floats, so that by giving him discretion within those six hours no difficulty such as has been complained of would arise.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am not a seaman, and I regret that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] nor the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] nor the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILSON] is not, and therefore better posted than probably any of us upon the subject; but it would seem to me that even on a six-hour permit it provides the easiest kind of blackmailing opportunity.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. It does not seem so to me. In the first place, there are but two things to be found out as a result of the muster. One is as to whether or not the proper percentage of qualified seamen are there, and we have provided a means by which their qualifications can be determined almost on sight. The other is with regard to language.

Mr. MANN. Does it not require an examination of the papers in every case? How would one know whether a man is an able seaman unless you examine the certificate?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. We provide that the papers themselves shall be prima facie evidence.

Mr. MANN. But you have to examine the papers in each case.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. That is true, but it does not take long, as the gentleman knows, to examine the papers that state that a seaman has certain qualifications, unless you attempt to go behind the returns and undertake to find out whether the papers have been properly issued.

Mr. MANN. Well, take my part of the country. He files an affidavit with a collector of customs in the city of Chicago, and it would take him an hour or two hours to get down to South Chicago to get in touch with the vessel at all; and if he had to go to Michigan City it would take him more than six hours to go to Michigan City. Michigan City is controlled by the collector of customs at the port of Chicago, and the same condition is true all over the coast of the United States. How would you be able to do it? All you could do in the last instance would be to send a telegram demanding that the vessel be held. It would be the easiest thing in the world to blackmail.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. In the general run of cases six hours is ample time.

Mr. MANN. That might be true in the general run of cases.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard in opposition to the amendment. I want to ask the gentleman who has charge of the bill if he will not accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]? He is not here; there are several gentlemen who are vitally interested in this bill, who, not knowing that it was going to come up to-day, are not here this afternoon. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has pointed out, to leave this section the way it is would absolutely place it within the power of any one citizen to hold up every ship in any port in the United States. With as few members as there are here present now I do not think we ought to undertake to pass such drastic legislation.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, and I presume the chairman of the committee has the same opinion, I would not agree to that amendment. The amendment offered by the chairman of the committee gives protection of six hours' time, in which the collector of the port has discretion. If you strike out the words "and shall" and insert the word "or" in the case, it gives to the collector discretion without qualification as to the time. Now, with regard to permitting any citizen of the United States by affidavit—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania (continuing). To furnish information of this kind—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Just a moment. I have no objection to the gentleman talking, but I hope he will get five minutes' additional time, because he is talking in my time now.

I want the gentleman to ask for five minutes when he gets through, because he has been consuming my time.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I am simply replying to the gentleman's interrogatory, and if he does not desire a reply to the question I have no desire to impose myself either upon him or the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want the gentleman to ask for five minutes, so that I may have some time to talk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I do not decline to yield, of course not.

The SPEAKER. If nobody is going to argue the amendment the thing to do is to put the question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am going to argue it when the gentleman gets through. I have yielded to him.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to make any remarks?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry if the gentleman from Pennsylvania misunderstood me. I did not refuse to yield to him, my colleague on the committee; I would yield to him always. The only thing I suggested was that he was taking up my time with a statement, and I hoped that he would get some time for me. Waiting for six hours is of no advantage. I have talked to shipping men, and they tell me it would take from 6 to 24 hours to make a muster of the crew and go through the necessary examination. You put into the hands of any person, without any punishment, the power to compel absolutely a muster of the crew just as often as he wants to of every ship that comes into a port, and I repeat what I have said before, that if we do that we would put it in the power of any one man to tie up indefinitely all the shipping in any port in the United States.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I offer the following amendment, to come at the end of this section.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 14, after the word "section," insert:
"Provided, That any person that shall knowingly make a false affidavit for such purpose shall be deemed guilty of perjury, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$500 or be punished not exceeding one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, within the discretion of the Secretary."

Mr. ALEXANDER. That ought to go in after the amendment which has been agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I thought the gentleman's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. You say after the section, and that is where my amendment was inserted.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I wanted it at the end.

Mr. HARDY. We have no objection to the penalty, but it seems to me that the law already provides a penalty against perjury, and I want to know whether the gentleman thinks he is adding anything to the law as it stands?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman is mistaken; I have looked into that, and there is no law on the statute books that makes a false affidavit a perjury.

Mr. HARDY. We have no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Washington to the fact that evidently there is a clerical error toward the last of his amendment. It says "or be punished not exceeding one year." Of course it ought to be "imprisonment."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks leave to change the phraseology of his amendment by striking out the words "be punished" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "by imprisonment."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the gentleman's attention to the latter part of his amendment, where, I think, it is wrong, if the Clerk will read it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Of course the "in the discretion of the Secretary" should be "in the discretion of the court."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I did not look at the amendment after I dictated it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the word "Secretary" and insert the word "court."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the word "Secretary" will be changed to the word "court."

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer as an amendment, on page 15, to strike out all after the word "crew," in line 1, and the whole of lines 2 and 3, down to and including the word "vessel," in line 4.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 15 by striking out all after the word "crew" in line 1, the whole of lines 2 and 3 and line 4 up to the word "nor."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard on that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the purpose of that amendment is to strike out the language test. I would like very much for the gentlemen who are present to understand the situation in regard to this matter.

The bill as it stands proposes that all vessels that come into American ports, not only American vessels, but all vessels that come into American ports, shall carry a certain percentage of their crew in all departments that can understand any order of their officers. Now, the purpose of that amendment is well understood by everyone who has had anything to do with this bill. It is to do away with Chinese crews upon various vessels, a consummation devoutly to be wished. There is no patriotic American but would like to see that accomplished, and I do not believe that there is anyone who has given the question study but that thinks it ought to be done if it can be done.

But I want to call attention to the situation as it is upon the Pacific in particular as to what the result of this amendment will be. I want to quote just a sentence or two from the hearings—a statement made by the distinguished chairman of the committee when Mr. Schwerin, of San Francisco, was before it. The chairman said:

As I understand you, you suspect that this language is inserted here for the purpose of excluding Chinese crews from the ships?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if it does, I am opposed to it, because I quite agree with you that under existing conditions it is proper to use Chinese crews.

Mr. SCHWERIN. That is what is aimed at here, and it has been openly stated so by many labor leaders, and I know it.

Then I asked Mr. Schwerin what would be the result. He replied:

Mr. SCHWERIN. The Americans would lose five ships under their flag—that is all—and American officers their jobs.

I want to call your attention to the fact as to why the distinguished chairman, I am satisfied, made that statement, and why I agree with him in regard to it. You take it upon the Pacific Ocean to-day, and there is one line of American vessels running from San Francisco to the Orient, namely, the Pacific Mail. That line runs in direct competition with a Japanese line that is subsidized \$100,000 in gold for each round trip for each ship. Now, do not forget that. The Japanese vessels employ oriental cheap crews. The Pacific Mail employs the same character of crews. If this bill goes into effect in regard to the language test, the American vessel will have to have English-speaking crews, which will add about \$100,000 expense to each round trip, making a difference, considering the subsidy, between the Japanese and American ships of \$200,000 for each round trip. It is not necessary for me to stop and argue what will be the result. The result will be exactly as Mr. Schwerin says: "The Americans will lose five ships under their flag." They will immediately take the Japanese flag. That will be the only result. And at once, instead of having the American ships and Chinese crews, we will have Japanese ships with Japanese crews. Now, that is the condition at San Francisco. Up at Seattle there are two lines of Japanese vessels which run out of that port. They are subsidized, but they are slower ships. They are subsidized about \$25,000 on one line for each round trip for each ship and about \$50,000 in gold for each vessel for a round trip on the other line. From Seattle still runs one American ship, the only ship engaged exclusively in the over-seas trade under the American flag which is to-day running without a subsidy. Now, if you make the change, the result will be that vessel—the *Minnesota*—will have to employ English-speaking crews, against oriental-speaking crews upon the Japanese vessel. The result will be the Japanese flag will at once fly on that great American ship.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask for 10 minutes more.

Mr. MANN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Ten minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Now, I want to call the attention of the gentlemen of the House to a further point. I have been trying to find some way, and I have sought earnestly and honestly to see if there was any way in which this bill could be supported and not absolutely destroy American shipping on the Pacific coast. If so, I was willing to vote for it. But it will only destroy American shipping and not benefit a single American sailor or a single American ship upon the Pacific Ocean. Then, why should we do it?

There is not a single American sailor, so far as I know—perhaps there may be a few, but I doubt if there is a single American sailor—upon the Pacific Ocean, upon any of these lines, that would be affected. Now, I want you to understand that when you are making this change you are not making it for the benefit of American sailors. You are proposing to put these vessels under the Japanese flag, without benefitting anybody in this country. These ships will go under the Japanese flag, and continue to carry their oriental crews, but will lose their American officers.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will yield in just a moment. I want to finish with this point, and then I will yield to the gentleman. I want to call the attention of the House to the situation at Seattle and on Puget Sound, where it is a little more aggravated than it is at San Francisco, because at San Francisco the difference would be that you would have American vessels under the Japanese flag. But up at Seattle we have two English lines that run from Seattle to the Orient. We have two Japanese lines that run from Seattle to the Orient. We have one line that runs from South America up to Seattle, making four lines in all. Those English vessels employ Chinese crews. I am not sure about the German line, whether it employs a Chinese crew or not, but I think it does.

Now, suppose we should pass a law that would compel them to take off their Chinese crews. That would impose an expense for each round trip of at least \$50,000. Right here, across the border [indicating on map], right at this point, in sight of Seattle, is Vancouver, British Columbia, a foreign port. The Canadian Pacific Railway has its terminus there. The Northern Pacific Railway has its terminals there. The Great Northern has its terminals there, and the Milwaukee is rapidly building to that port. Now, do you suppose that these foreign vessels coming from the Orient to Puget Sound are going to come down to Seattle or Tacoma, take chances on the desertion of their crews, and pay \$50,000 for each voyage, when they can just as well stop at Vancouver, when there is not a single disadvantage in their so doing—not one? They have a good port there. They have spent millions of dollars to improve it. So that the only thing you will do by this bill will be to drive these vessels—all of them—from American ports to British ports. Instead of coming to Seattle they will go to Vancouver. What justification can there be for such legislation? The friends of this bill admit its main purpose is to induce foreign sailors to desert in American ports.

There is no doubt about it. No one who is in favor of this bill and studies it carefully will dispute that fact. That is the object of the bill. I am not going to argue whether that is a good proposition or a bad one. The friends of this bill argue that it is a good one because, they say, after a sailor deserts they will have to increase his wages to get him back on the vessel, and therefore it will raise the wages of sailors all over the world, and that will be a good thing. I doubt whether this will be the result when they come to the crews of vessels flying the English, German, or Japanese flag.

But however that may be, is the Japanese vessel going to come down to Seattle, where crews will be induced to desert? Men favoring this bill say that the Japanese sailors are learning to desert. Is the Japanese vessel going to come down to where its crew will desert, where they will be subject to the restrictions that this bill proposes in regard to the character of the crew and in other respects, when they can just as well stop at Vancouver? I want the Members from the Pacific coast to understand the situation and to know when they vote for this bill that, if it goes on the statute books, in six months' time there will not be an American flag on the Pacific Ocean in the

deep-sea trade. If it goes on the statute books, so far as Seattle and Tacoma are concerned, with reference to the foreign trade, they might as well be blotted from the map.

You will absolutely destroy those cities as foreign ports, and I want the gentlemen here, especially those from the Pacific coast, to know it when they vote, so that they can not plead that they did not understand the result that was going to follow.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. Speaking of these Japanese lines from San Francisco to the Orient, is it not a fact that they have Chinese crews to the extent of at least 75 per cent?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No, sir; it is not a fact.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a fact that the Japanese vessels that sail from Seattle have at least 75 per cent Chinese crews?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No, sir; it is not a fact.

Mr. RAKER. What proportion?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. A very small proportion of the crews upon Japanese vessels are Chinamen. There are a few in the steward's department. To make absolutely sure that I was not mistaken about that matter I asked the president of the sailors' union not two hours ago, and he assured me that there are only a few Chinese employed in the steward's department. Most of the crew upon Japanese vessels are Japanese. They employ their own people.

There is just one other point that I want to call attention to generally on this language-test proposition. The bill not only prescribes what kind of crews foreign vessels shall have and what language they shall speak on Japanese and other vessels, but under this bill an English vessel is prohibited from employing British subjects in many cases, because there are a great many British subjects who are sailors who do not speak the English language.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a fact that under the present arrangement between the United States and Japan these Japanese could not desert and keep in line with the treaty agreement or the gentleman's agreement; that by deserting they would come into the United States and violate the very treaty or gentleman's agreement I was talking about in regard to the Japanese?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. On the contrary, I will quote the authority that I referred to awhile ago, that I think is the highest authority there is on this question. I quote the distinguished president of the sailors' union. He says that the Japanese will desert. He thinks that thereby he will be enabled to increase wages at all Pacific ports.

I think there is no question that they will desert. This bill leaves it wide open anywhere in the United States for any sailor to come in, leave his vessel, and evade our immigration laws. That is one of the beauties of this bill.

Mr. MANN. I should like to ask the gentleman a question, if he will yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I should like to ask the gentleman whether he thinks a Japanese sailor who had made a contract to serve for a certain length of time would be restrained by a gentleman's agreement between nations, not to desert if he was going to break his contract.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I should not think so. I should think any sailor who would enter into a solemn agreement with the owner of a vessel to serve for a round trip, and then desert, would not be restrained by a gentleman's agreement or any other kind.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman elaborate the point that higher wages will follow the desertions?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have never been able to follow that argument exactly. I will try to state it as I understand it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to answer the gentleman's question. This is the vital part of the whole bill.

Mr. MANN. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The theory upon which this bill has been drawn, as I understand it, is this: I will take an exact illustration. A vessel comes into Seattle from Japan. It has a Japanese crew. That crew deserts when it gets into the port of Seattle. Under this bill there is no authority to take those men back to their vessel. They can leave

it at will. Now, their theory is that the crew will not go back until they have agreed to increase their wages. It might work in some places, but it will not work in Seattle, where they can stop at Vancouver. No Japanese shipowner is going to be so negligent of his own interest as to come down to Seattle when it would be of no advantage to him and might cause him endless trouble and great expense.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Will not either Chinese or Japanese vessels—

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that this discussion is not on the question before the House; it is the language test.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Will not both Chinese and Japanese sailors be taken up by the authorities and deported?

Mr. RAKER. You can not deport the Japanese laborers.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. You can deport the Chinese.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will tell you, gentlemen, that as far as the Pacific Ocean is concerned, this bill is in every way in favor of the Japanese. Japan will control the entire trade in that ocean with the United States within six months after this law goes upon the statute books. If it in any way favored the American sailor or the American shipowner I would be in favor of it, but I am opposed and shall not vote knowingly to turn the Pacific Ocean over to Japan.

Mr. RAKER. If the same law applied to the Japanese that now applies to the Chinese there would be no objection raised; the objection now raised by the gentleman from Washington would not apply, would it?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, if conditions were different, the same result might not happen.

Mr. RAKER. If the Japanese laborers were prevented from entering into the United States, the question of their desertion would not be an objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; the question of the desertion would not be, but you would turn the whole matter over to the Japanese, as far as the ship is concerned, in any event.

Mr. RAKER. What is the difference between a Japanese vessel having a Japanese crew and an American vessel having Japanese and Chinese crews registered under the American flag?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The difference is twofold. You have American officers and pay them high wages on American ships; you would replace them with Japanese. If the time should come when we had difficulty and need of transports, these vessels of the Pacific Mail Co. are suitable for that purpose, and they are the only vessels under the American flag except one on the Pacific Ocean that are.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Are not two-thirds of the Japanese vessels manned by American captains?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; that was true a few years ago, but it is not true now.

Mr. RAKER. How long since it ceased?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Not until recently.

Mr. RAKER. Very recently, indeed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; within two or three years.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the wool bill in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the wool bill in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, in less than five minutes I think I can do away with the argument of the gentleman from Washington. This bill will drive no ship from the sea under the language test. The gentleman speaks of Mr. Schwerin, who testified before our committee that nearly every Chinaman he had could comply with the requirements of this bill, for the reason that he understood every order naturally to be given on board ship.

The English law requires that 70 per cent of their crew shall understand the language of the officers. The Swedish law is more strenuous still, and to show how little there is in what the gentleman from Washington has been saying, Mr. Hibberd, representing the Pacific coast interests, appeared before our committee, and this statement appears in the hearings:

Mr. HARDY. Do you think it is safe for a ship to be navigated unless 75 per cent of the crew understand the orders—it need not be English, but they can not understand? Mr. Parine said that among his sailors, Chinese though they were, every one of them understood orders such as were given.

Mr. HIBBERD. We never carry Chinese crews, so I can not answer that.

Mr. HARDY. The thing there is that they ought to have enough knowledge of English for a member of the crew to understand when he is spoken to and do what he is told to do.

Mr. HIBBERD. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Then, if 75 per cent of them understand you can trust nearly all of them, and I think that the English law requires that 75 per cent can speak the English language.

The CHAIRMAN. We did not put that in for the reason that we did not want to prohibit against Germans, Swedes, Chinamen, nor Japanese, but simply that he understands the orders of the master when given in Chinese, Japanese, Hindu, or in a sign language—he ought to understand the orders.

Mr. HIBBERD. That does not interest the men on the coast very much.

Mr. Hibberd, representing that interest, said that it did not concern the men on the coast very much; and it is a fact that each and every one of them said that the provision would not interfere with their sailing or their vessels. The truth is, Mr. Schwerin said his Japanese sailors understood all of the orders perfectly, and that not 75 per cent but that 100 per cent of them understood the orders.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the Clerk report the first amendment that appears in the Record.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "States," in line 10, page 2, amend by inserting the words "navigating the ocean and the Great Lakes and on voyages of more than 12 hours' length."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, where does that amendment come in? Is that an amendment to section 1 of the bill? Is that something that has been passed over?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to return to section 1 for the purpose of offering that amendment.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to return to page 2, section 1, for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and the Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's objection comes too late.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman up trying to object before the Chair announced the decision?

Mr. BULKLEY. I was.

The SPEAKER. Very well. The gentleman from Ohio objects.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the gentleman's purpose is in denying unanimous consent, but if he is trying in that way to make time, he is mistaken in his attitude in regard to it, for if he insists upon it I shall make the point of no quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I did not understand what the gentleman said.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I merely said that I did not understand the purpose of the gentleman from Ohio in making his objection, and of course I have not the right to ask him, and do not ask him.

Mr. BULKLEY. But I am perfectly willing to answer the gentleman. I object because I do not like the amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I suppose the gentleman does not want it to apply to the Great Lakes?

Mr. BULKLEY. No; I want it to apply to the Great Lakes, and I think it does as it reads now; but I object to the 12-hour part of it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. When the amendment is pending, why not move to strike out that part of it at that time?

Mr. BULKLEY. I do not want the 12-hour part of it in at all. If the gentleman will assure me that he will cut that out, I will give unanimous consent to return to the paragraph.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If the gentleman wants to move to strike that out, I shall not force it. It was put in at the suggestion of other parties.

Mr. BULKLEY. I would rather not give consent unless that is understood.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio withdraw his objection?

Mr. BULKLEY. No; I object.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman who is in charge of the bill a question. On page 14, section 12, line 24, we find this language:

Except those navigating rivers exclusively and except as provided in section 1 of this act.

I do not know what is meant by the statement "section 1 of this act."

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, section 1 of this act provides for the amendment of section 4516, and requires that the master must ship, if obtainable, a number equal to the number of those whose services he has been deprived of, and the clause to which the gentleman has reference—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That refers to ships, but the language is:

That no vessel, except those navigating the rivers exclusively, and except as provided in section 1 of this act.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Where is the gentleman reading?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. On page 14, lines 23, 24, and 25. I never have been able to understand what that language means.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. That applies to section 1. Section 12 says that no vessels, except those navigating rivers exclusively and except as provided in section 1 of this act, shall be permitted to depart from any port, and so forth. Section 1 of the act provides that he must secure certain seamen when desertions take place, if obtainable, so that if they are not obtainable he would still be permitted to depart, and that is what that language applies to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. That is what it is intended to apply to.

Mr. HARDY. It is intended to apply to the unalterable requirements in section 1 that exempt the vessels which could not get a crew the other way.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has an amendment to offer, but he is not here. I am willing to go through the discussion of this bill to-day, but if the gentleman is going to insist upon a vote upon it without giving the gentleman from Pennsylvania an opportunity to be heard, I do not like to do it. The gentleman has been very courteous, but I do not think he ought to try to pass the bill—

Mr. ALEXANDER. We are going to pass the bill to-day, and if the gentleman wants to offer the amendment in the absence of Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, I will not object and will not resist his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know what it is.

Mr. ALEXANDER. At the same time, the gentleman wants us to delay the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill as amended to final passage—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have an amendment pending.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 17, strike out the words "on deck," and after the words "Great Lakes" insert the following: "Or as a fisherman, and upon examination by the local inspector, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Navigation, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, shall direct, shall satisfy such inspector that he is competent to handle a lifeboat and other crafts and equipment used for saving life at sea."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard on that amendment. Especially to vessels on the Great Lakes and on inland waters this is very important. I call to the attention of the House that the bill provides that every ship shall have two able seamen for each lifeboat. Under the regulations made recently the number of lifeboats in some instances has been more than doubled. Now, if we adopt this amendment which I have offered, it makes any man who has been drilled and is capable of handling a lifeboat an able seaman. If you do not do this, you increase, in some instances, three times the number of men upon the deck for no purpose whatever except to be used in time of accident. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact, as I said the other day, in regard to able seamen, that many men have been upon the Great Lakes and upon the ocean on deck for three years and more and yet know nothing whatever about handling a lifeboat, have never handled a rowboat, and know no more about them than if they had been spending their time in this House. Now, this proposes to make a definition of able seaman that will mean something, so when we put men on a lifeboat they shall know something about it. By striking out the words "on deck," then it includes both firemen and those in the steward's department. The fireman and those in the steward's department know as much about handling the lifeboats as the so-called able seaman.

They all get exactly the same training. If you adopt this amendment, when a man makes an application for a position

upon a vessel he will have to know something about handling a lifeboat. I have not been able to understand how any man on either side of this House can object to this amendment in view of the fact that we have been saying that we want to increase the safety of life at sea. If you want to do that, let us put the right kind of men in the lifeboats. This will not work a hardship on anybody unless on the shipowner. I hope there will be no opposition to this amendment on either side of the House.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's purpose is not alone to provide that skilled seamen shall be used in lowering the lifeboats. The amendment agreed to awhile ago expressly provides that the men used in lowering lifeboats shall be drilled in the handling and lowering of lifeboats under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

And the very purpose of that amendment was to provide that vessels shall not depart from any port of the United States unless they shall have a sufficient crew with which to man each lifeboat, and that they shall be drilled in lowering and managing lifeboats. And that amendment has been already agreed to. The gentleman's purpose is to qualify the provision with reference to able seamen. He is opposed to that provision in the bill, and hence his amendment provides:

Strike out the words "on deck," and after the words "Great Lakes," insert the following:

"Or as a fisherman, and upon examination by the local inspector, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Navigation, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, shall direct, shall satisfy such inspector that he is competent to handle a lifeboat and other crafts and equipment used in saving life."

Now, the effect of this amendment will be to nullify the other amendment which has been agreed to, that not less than two of these seamen shall be able seamen and qualified to lower lifeboats. In other words, the purpose is to permit the ship's officers to use stewards, waiters, or anybody else on board for this purpose, provided they are drilled in that work. Our object in framing this section is to provide that the deck crew shall be able seamen, and at least two able seamen to each lifeboat, and that all those who man lifeboats shall be qualified to handle them.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The language of the bill to which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] offers his amendment is:

No person shall be rated as an able seaman unless he is 19 years of age or upward, and has had at least three years' service on deck at sea or on the Great Lakes.

Does that expression "on deck" include fishermen's boats?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I do not think there is any question but that it does.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not think it does.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I think there is not any question but that a fisherman, when he is at sea, is on deck.

Mr. MANN. Having heard the opinion of my seaman friend from Pennsylvania, I would like also the opinion of my seaman friend from Missouri, whether he thinks service on deck will include service on fishermen's boats?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not know why it would not.

Mr. MANN. That is not my question.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The best seaman we have is the fisherman.

Mr. MANN. Is this service on deck? I want it, so it, at least, will go in the Record.

Mr. ALEXANDER. We do not want it so that those in the steward's department, the waiters, and the chambermaids, and so forth, shall man the ship. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is talking about the paragraph that is not under consideration. I am talking about the one that is, namely, the definition of what an able seaman is. Let us have no misunderstanding about it. If it does not include men doing work on fishermen's boats, it ought to do so, and if it does, let us say so.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. If there is any question about it, we would have no objection to the words "fishermen at sea or on the Great Lakes" being included, but to take the rest of the gentleman's amendment would be another proposition.

Mr. MANN. I am supposed to be talking about the gentleman's amendment. Do the gentlemen in charge of the bill have any doubt that it does include service on fishing boats?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I have no doubt but that it includes fishermen, but if there are any gentlemen on the floor who have any doubt as to its including fishermen I, for one, have no objection to an amendment being offered that will include fishermen on the seas and on the Great Lakes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to its final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution authorizing Federal bureaus doing hygienic and demographic work to participate in the exhibition to be held in connection with the Fifteenth International Congress on Hygiene and Demography.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution authorizing Federal bureaus doing hygienic and demographic work to participate in the exhibition to be held in connection with the Fifteenth International Congress on Hygiene and Demography; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of War to investigate the claims of American citizens for damages suffered within American territory and growing out of the late insurrection in Mexico.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to send to the Clerk's desk and have read the House joint resolution that I hold in my hand.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 346.

Whereas, by an error in printing the report of the House Committee on Invalid Pensions upon H. R. 21230, approved June 19, 1912 (Private, No. 26), the designation of the military service of one Thomas Davidson, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, was changed to read "Company H" of said regiment: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the paragraph in H. R. 21230, approved June 19, 1912 (Private, No. 26), granting an increase of pension to one Thomas Davidson be corrected and amended so as to read as follows:

"The name of Thomas Davidson, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 a month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado moves to discharge the Committee on Invalid Pensions from the consideration of this resolution and consider it now. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I will suggest that in passing the resolution the reference should be made to the law, not to the bill, both in the title and body of the resolution. The gentleman should put in the title of the law. That is what we want to correct. We do not want to correct the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. The title to the law is in the resolution. I copied the title of the law in the resolution. I did not refer to the number of the omnibus bill, but referred to the number of the act—Private, 26.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the title of the law be inserted in the body of this resolution and in its title. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution as amended.

The House joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

COMMERCE OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY.

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a very interesting address delivered by Mr. O. P. Austin, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, on the commerce of the Mississippi Valley.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech on the commerce of the Mississippi Valley delivered by Mr. O. P. Austin. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SURVIVORS OF THE ANDREWS RAID.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and before the Chair submits that request I wish to make a very brief statement.

On the 21st of December, 1911, I introduced a bill (H. R. 16639) granting pensions to William Bensinger, William J. Knight, Wilson W. Brown, John R. Porter, and Daniel A. Dorsey, five of them in all, being the survivors of the famous Andrews raid. This bill is pending in the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and I earnestly hope it may receive early consideration and favorable report at the hands of the committee. I suppose every gentleman in the House knows the story of that heroic exploit, unexcelled for bravery and daring in the bloody annals of war.

The cool deliberation of their leader, the carefully wrought plan, the noble patriotic devotion of the heroic men who risked and some of whom lost their lives in executing that plan, the capture of that famous old engine "The General," the mad race for life, the fruitless attempt to destroy track and bridge so as to block pursuit, the final abandonment of "The General" by the raiders, their pursuit and capture by the Confederate forces—all these make a thrilling story of dash and excitement and courage without a parallel in history.

Of the 22 men in this expedition, 20 were furnished by Ohio, most of them coming from the Twenty-first, Second, and Thirty-third Regiments. Many of these men I have known well, some of them, I am proud to say, intimately. They were a heroic band, the story of whose courage and fortitude stirs the heart of every American. Of the 22 men who thus contributed one of the most brilliant pages in our country's history, only five remain; four of them are residents of Ohio, one lives in Illinois, but wherever they may abide, the story of their heroism will continue to inspire the youth of the land, and when the last of the five shall have answered the final roll call and gone to meet his comrades on "fame's eternal camping ground" the Andrews Raiders will be remembered, and I trust that a grateful Nation may not have to regret that it failed to provide for these old heroes in their declining years.

In connection with House bill 16639 and the story of the Andrews or Mitchell raid, as it is sometimes called, a very interesting account recently appeared in the Pittsburgh Gazette-Times, and I ask unanimous consent to print this account in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. The bill and the newspaper article to which I have referred are as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16639) granting a pension to William Bensinger and others.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, at the rate of \$100 per month, the names of William Bensinger, Company G, Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry; William J. Knight, Company K, Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry; Wilson W. Brown, Company F, Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry; John R. Porter, Company G, Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry; and Daniel A. Dorsey, Company H, Thirty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, the pension herein provided to be in lieu of any and all pensions now received by said soldiers, whether under the general law or by special act of Congress.

[From the Pittsburgh Gazette-Times, Jan. 14, 1912.]

EXPLOIT OF THE ANDREWS RAIDERS REVIVED—CONGRESSMAN'S APPLICATION TO GIVE SPECIAL PENSIONS TO THE FIVE SURVIVORS OF THAT WILD RIDE ON "THE GENERAL," A LOCOMOTIVE THE RAIDERS STOLE FROM THE CONFEDERATES, RENEWS INTEREST IN ONE OF THE MOST DARING INCIDENTS OF THE CIVIL WAR—20 OF THE MEN FROM OHIO.

One of the most daring exploits of the Civil War was recalled a few days since by the publication in the Gazette-Times of the following dispatch from Findlay, Ohio:

"Almost fifty years after they had pierced the Confederate lines near Chattanooga and stole a locomotive in the heart of the Confederacy the five survivors of the Andrews raiders will be granted a special pension of \$100 a month, if a bill introduced by Congressman Willis, of this district, becomes a law. The survivors are William Bensinger, 72, of McComb, this county; W. J. Knight, Stryker, Ohio; W. W. Brown, 74, East Toledo; D. A. Dorsey, 76, Lincoln, Neb.; and John R. Porter, residing in Illinois."

The story of the Andrews raiders and their bold seizure of "The General," the locomotive destined to become famous (it now occupies a post of honor in the Union Station at Chattanooga), will bear telling again. Grayheads there be who will yet thrill at its recital, and there may be many younger persons to whom it will come as interesting information. The narrative is most interestingly set forth in an attractive brochure issued some months ago at Nashville. Here it is:

BEGINNING OF THE ADVENTURE.

When, on a bright April day in 1862, the trainman sang out, "Big Shanty: 20 minutes for breakfast," the hearts of a score of brave men beat faster, as they knew the hour had come for the beginning of one of the grandest exploits in history.

The men, from their dress, were citizens, and had boarded the north-bound train at Marietta, a pretty little Georgia town 20 miles north of Atlanta. They paid their fares to different points, and from the conversation one would suppose that they were refugees from the Yankees; but in reality they were disguised soldiers of the United States Army under command of Gen. Mitchell, then in middle Tennessee, bound south.

They were volunteers to do a dangerous work, and were to get through the country as best they could to Marietta, then board a train bound for Chattanooga, and at Big Shanty, 7 miles away, while the crew and passengers were at breakfast, detach the engine, run north, obstruct the track, cut the wires, and burn bridges, of which there were 15 between Big Shanty and Chattanooga. This was the brilliant scheme. How well it was carried out is here shown:

STRANGERS BOARD TRAIN.

On the morning of the 12th of April, 1862, Capt. W. A. Fuller left Atlanta at 6 o'clock in charge of the passenger train, having three empty freight cars next to the engine, which were intended to bring commissary stores from Chattanooga to Atlanta. When he reached Marietta, 20 miles distant from Atlanta, a considerable party of strangers, dressed in citizens' clothes, got on board and paid their fares, some to one point and some to another. They all claimed to be refugees from within the Yankee lines desirous of joining the Confederate army.

Seven miles from Marietta, at Big Shanty, the train stopped for breakfast. Most of the passengers and train's crew went to the breakfast house, which was situated some 40 feet from the track. At this time Big Shanty was the location of a camp of instruction, called Camp McDonald, and there were about 3,000 Confederate recruits there at the time, being drilled ready to send to the front for active service. The passengers had taken seats at the table. Capt. Fuller was sitting on the opposite side of the table from the railroad, and facing the train. He saw through the window some of the strangers who got on at Marietta get on the engine in an excited manner and start off rapidly, with the three freight cars detached from the passenger train. He remarked to his engineer, Jeff Cain, and to Anthony Murphy, who was present, and at that time foreman of the Western & Atlantic Railroad shops: "Some one has gone off with our train." All three arose and hurried out of the house just as the engine passed out of sight.

NOT DREAMED THEY WERE FEDERALISTS.

Some deserters had been reported as having left Camp McDonald, and the commanding officer had requested Capt. Fuller to look out for them and arrest any soldier who attempted to get on his train without a passport. No one had any idea that the parties in possession of the engine were Federalists, but supposed that it had been taken by parties desiring to desert Camp McDonald, and who would run off a short distance and abandon it.

Capt. Fuller, Murphy, and Cain left Big Shanty with a clear and well-defined motive and a fixed determination to recapture the engine, no matter who the parties were. They started out on foot and alone, nothing daunted in putting muscle in competition with steam. Capt. Fuller outran his companions and soon reached Moon's Station, two miles from Big Shanty. Here he learned from the trackmen that the men with the engine stopped and took their tools from them by force. They reported that on the engine and in the freight cars there were 24 or 25 men, and that while some of the men gathered the tools, others climbed the telegraph poles and cut the wires in two places, carrying away about 100 yards of wire. This statement satisfied Capt. Fuller that these men were Federalists in disguise. This added new stimulus to his resolve. The determination then was not only to capture his engine, but the Federalists.

PURSUIT IN HAND CAR.

With the assistance of the track hands he placed on the track a hand car and pushed back for his engineer, when he soon met Messrs. Murphy and Cain.

Knowing the schedules, grades, stations, and distances so well, he was confident that by using great effort he could reach Etowah River by the time the fugitives could reach Kingston. At Kingston he knew they would have to contend with a number of freight trains, which would necessarily detain them several minutes.

As soon as he got Mr. Murphy and Mr. Cain on board he told them his plan to push on to Etowah as quickly as possible, for there he hoped to get old "Yonah," an engine used at Cooper's iron works; and his plan proved successful. In the "rapid transit" by hand car Capt. Fuller, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Cain took turns in pushing, two running on foot and pushing, while the other rested; one mile from Moon Station they found a large pile of cross-ties on the track—placed there by the fugitives to obstruct pursuit. The obstructions were removed, and they pushed on to Acworth.

Here they pressed into service such guns as they could find and were joined by two citizens—Mr. Smith, of Jonesboro, and Steve Stokely, of Cobb County—who rendered valuable service in the subsequent pursuit. Resuming their journey they found no obstruction until they reached a short curve 2 miles from Etowah. Here two rails from the outside of the curve had been taken up.

The result was the hand car was ditched. In a few seconds Capt. Fuller and his men had the car on the track beyond the break, and with renewed energy and determination they pushed on to Etowah, where, to their great joy, they found the engine, as they supposed they would. And yet it appeared a slim chance. The engine was standing on the sidetrack, with the tender on the turn table. The tender was turned around and pushed to the engine and a coal car attached. Some six or eight Confederate soldiers volunteered in the chase and took passage in the coal car.

RAN 60 MILES AN HOUR.

From Etowah to Kingston Capt. Fuller ran at the rate of 60 miles an hour, and found that the fugitives had passed by. A large number of freight trains had pulled by the station so as to let the fugitives out at the farther end of the track.

The agent informed Capt. Fuller that the leader of the fugitives claimed to be a Confederate officer who had impressed the train at Big Shanty, and the three cars were loaded with fixed ammunition for Gen. Beauregard, at Corinth. Capt. Fuller, he said, was behind with the regular passenger train. He insisted that the agent should let him have a switch key and instruct the conductors of the down trains to pull by and get out of his way, as it was important for him to go on to Chattanooga and Corinth as rapidly as possible.

So authoritative was he in his demands, and so plausible in his speech, that the agent, a patriotic man, believing his story, carried out

his request, and so the fugitives, by the finesse of their leader, passed by one great obstruction. The freight trains were gathered here, and so heavy to move that had Capt. Fuller stopped to get them out of his way, to pass, his delay would have been too long. Finding that he could not pass with old "Yonah," he abandoned it.

The Rome engine was on the "Y," headed for Chattanooga, with one car attached. He immediately took possession of it, and continued the chase with all who would volunteer to go with him. He had not proceeded far before he found cross-ties on the track every 200 or 300 yards.

DROPPED TIES FROM REAR.

After passing Kingston the fugitives punched out the end of the rear car, which enabled them to drop out ties without slackening up. Capt. Fuller was forced to lose time in stopping to remove these obstructions.

Laboring under these disadvantages, the pursuers redoubled their energy and proceeded to Adairsville. When he reached a point 4 miles from Adairsville he found 60 yards of track torn up, and set out on foot, calling on his men to follow. When he had gone half a mile he looked back and saw none but Anthony Murphy following him. He made 2 miles as quick as he could run, and met the express freight. Having a gun and knowing the signal, the engineer recognized Capt. Fuller and stopped the train immediately.

Knowing that Mr. Murphy was only a short distance behind, the train was detained until he came up. He then took a position at the rear end of the train, 20 car lengths from the engine, and started backward, in the direction of Adairsville, without taking time to explain to the engineer or conductor. When he got within 200 yards of the switch at Adairsville, Capt. Fuller jumped off the train, ran ahead, and changed the switch so as to throw the cars on the sidetrack.

He accomplished this, changed the switch to the main track, and jumped on the engine, which had been uncoupled from the train. This feat was accomplished so quickly that the train and engine ran side by side for fully 300 yards. He now had only the engine with the following crew: A. Murphy, Peter Bracken, the engineer, Fleming Cox, the fireman, and Alonzo Martin, wood passer. He resumed the chase, making Calhoun, 10 miles distant, in 12 minutes. As he approached Calhoun, Capt. Fuller recognized the telegraph operator from Dalton, a lad 12 years old. The operator also recognized Capt. Fuller, and as the engine passed by, at the rate of 15 miles an hour, grasped Capt. Fuller's hand held out to him, and was safely landed on the engine.

NOTIFIES GEN. LEDBETTER.

The operator, having discovered that the wire had been cut, made his way down to Calhoun, looking for the break. As they sped along backward as fast as an engine with 5-foot 10-inch wheels could possibly run, Capt. Fuller wrote the following telegram to Gen. Ledbetter, then in command at Chattanooga:

"My train was captured this a. m. at Big Shanty, evidently by Federal soldiers in disguise. They are making rapidly for Chattanooga, possibly with an idea of burning the railroad bridges in their rear. If I do not capture them in the meantime, see that they do not pass Chattanooga."

Capt. Fuller's desire now was to reach Dalton and send the telegram before the fugitives could cut the wire beyond Dalton. Two miles beyond Calhoun the fugitives were sighted for the first time, and from their movements they were evidently greatly excited. They detached one of their freight cars and left it at the spot where they were discovered. They had partially taken up a rail, but that or the car did not detain Capt. Fuller.

He coupled the car to the engine without stopping, got on top of the freight car, and gave signals to the engineer by which he could run, as the car in front obscured his view. Two and a half miles farther Capt. Fuller came across another freight car which the fugitives had detached. As before, he coupled this on without stopping, and pushed on to Resaca, where he switched the two cars off on the siding.

JUMPS OVER RAILS.

Again he started with an engine only. Two miles north of Resaca, while standing on the rear of the tender, he discovered in a short curve a T rail diagonally across the track and being too close to stop, the engine went over it at the rate of 55 miles an hour. After this, until they reached Dalton, only occasionally were obstructions met with. At Dalton he dropped the telegraph operator with instructions to put through the telegram at all hazards, and continued the chase. Two miles beyond he overtook the fugitives tearing up the track in plain view of Col. Jesse A. Glenn's regiment, camped near by. They cut the telegraph wire just after the Dalton operator had flashed Capt. Fuller's telegram over it, preventing him from receiving the usual acknowledgment from Chattanooga.

The fugitives resumed their flight, and never, perhaps, did two engines with 5 feet 10 inch wheels make faster time than the pursued and the pursuer. The fugitives had the advantage, from the fact that the "General," a "Rogers," was headed for Chattanooga, while the "Texas," a "Danforth & Cook" engine, was running backward.

The 15 miles to Ringgold and 3 miles beyond was made in less time than Capt. Fuller ever made the same distance in 22 years' experience as a conductor. Half way between Ringgold and Graysville he got within one-quarter of a mile of the fugitives, who, being so closely pressed, set their only remaining freight car on fire, with a view of cutting it loose on the next bridge. The smoke of the "General" plainly evidenced that she was fagging.

The fugitives abandoned the engine and took to the woods in a westerly direction. Capt. Fuller now ran up and coupled on to the burning car. The fire was extinguished and the car sent back to Ringgold in charge of the engineer. As Capt. Fuller passed Ringgold he noticed some 50 or 75 militia mustering, and sent back word to the commanding officer to put all his militia on horseback and send them into the woods in pursuit of the fugitives as quickly as possible.

This was about half past 1 o'clock p. m. Although jaded and fatigued, Capt. Fuller, Anthony Murphy, Fleming Cox, and Alonzo Martin took to the woods in pursuit. When the fugitives abandoned the engine, Andrews, their leader, said: "Everyone take care of himself," and they left in squads of three or four. Four of them were run down in the fork of the Chickamauga River at Graysville, and one was forcibly persuaded to tell who they were.

The militia, mounted on fresh horses, scoured the woods that afternoon, and in a few days the last of the fugitives were captured.

Later there was a trial by military court, and eight of the number were executed in Atlanta as spies. Six were exchanged and eight escaped from prison at Atlanta. Thus ended one of the most daring exploits on record.

There were 22 men engaged in the enterprise. Twenty of them were from Ohio and two from Kentucky.

THE MEN IN THE PARTY.

The following-named men participated in the famous raid:
 James J. Andrews, leader, citizen of Flemingsburg, Ky.
 William H. Campbell, citizen of Kentucky.
 Marion A. Ross, sergeant major Second Ohio Infantry.
 William Pittenger, sergeant, Company G, Second Ohio Infantry.
 George D. Wilson, private, Company B, Second Ohio Infantry.
 Charles P. Shadrach, private, Company K, Second Ohio Infantry.
 Elihu H. Mason, sergeant, Company K, Twenty-first Ohio Infantry.
 John M. Scott, sergeant, Company F, Twenty-first Ohio Infantry.
 Wilson W. Brown, corporal, Company F, Twenty-first Ohio Infantry.
 Mark Wood, private, Company C, Twenty-first Ohio Infantry.
 John A. Wilson, private, Company C, Twenty-first Ohio Infantry.
 William Knight, private, Company E, Twenty-first Ohio Infantry.
 John R. Porter, private, Company G, Twenty-first Ohio Infantry.
 William Bensinger, private, Company G, Twenty-first Ohio Infantry.
 Robert Buffum, private, Company H, Twenty-first Ohio Infantry.
 Martin J. Hawkins, corporal, Company A, Thirty-third Ohio Infantry.
 William H. Reddick, corporal, Company B, Thirty-third Ohio Infantry.
 Daniel A. Dorsey, corporal, Company H, Thirty-third Ohio Infantry.
 John Wollam, private, Company C, Thirty-third Ohio Infantry.
 Samuel Slavens, private, Company E, Thirty-third Ohio Infantry.
 Samuel Robertson, private, Company G, Thirty-third Ohio Infantry.
 Jacob Parrott, private, Company K, Thirty-third Ohio Infantry.
 Eight of these men, whose names appear below, were executed by the Confederate authorities at Atlanta, Ga., in June, 1862: Andrews on June 7; and Campbell Ross, George D. Wilson, Shadrach, Scott, Slavens, and Robertson on June 18. On October 16, 1862, the eight following-named made their escape from prison at Atlanta, Ga.: Brown, Wood, John A. Wilson, Knight, Porter, Hawkins, Dorsey, and Wollam. The remaining six members of the raiding party were paroled at City Point, Va., March 17, 1863. Their names follow: Pittenger, Mason, Bensinger, Buffum, Reddick, and Parrott.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, August 5, 1912, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 26112) to prescribe the method by which the terms of service shall be computed under the act of May 11, 1912, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 26113) granting an appropriation for the destruction of predatory wild animals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 26114) to authorize the people of Porto Rico to construct a bridge across the Cano de Martin Pena, an estuary of the harbor of San Juan, P. R.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 26115) to provide for a uniform national bank currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution (H. Res. 659) to pay Michael Doyle for services as a Capitol policeman; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: Resolution (H. Res. 660) authorizing the appointment of a committee to investigate the Mississippi River levees and defining its duties, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Resolution (H. Res. 663) to make H. R. 22002 privileged; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 26116) granting an increase of pension to Adele Norton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 26117) authorizing the Secretary of War to confer upon David Davis the congressional medal of honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 26118) granting an increase of pension to George M. Walton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26119) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George Osborn, alias George Allen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 26120) granting a pension to Mary Jane Kuhns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 26121) for the relief of Louis Burle, alias Ganter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 26122) for the relief of William Allman and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 26123) granting a pension to Virginia A. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 26124) for the relief of John Dennis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 26125) granting a pension to Henrietta Gard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 26126) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph P. Leiter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOWMAN: Petitions of H. E. Young, of Alden Station, and of Hanover Council, No. 251, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Sugar Notch, Pa., favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BUTLER: Memorial of Spring City Council, No. 900, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Spring City, Pa., and of Paoli Council, No. 500, Paoli, Pa., favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the Inventors' Guild, favoring commission to investigate need of change in patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the National Association of Talking Machine Jobbers of Pittsburgh, Pa., against passage of House bill 22417, relative to change in patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the National Liberal Immigration League, favoring two battleships each year; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Petition of the American Opera House, Hopewell, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the National Association of Talking Machine Jobbers of Pittsburgh, Pa., against passage of the Oldfield bill, proposing change in patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Memorial of the National Association of Talking Machine Jobbers of Pittsburgh, Pa., against passage of the Oldfield bill, proposing change in the patent law; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PARRAN: Petitions of George Bancroft Council, No. 571, and of Fourth Estate Council, No. 170, Order Independent Americans, favoring passage of House bill 25309, requiring the flag of the United States to be displayed on all lighthouses of the United States and insular possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PALMER: Petition of citizens of Lansford, Pa., favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Bishop Rowe, of Alaska, favoring betterment of conditions of natives of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of the National Association of Talking Machine Jobbers of Pittsburgh, Pa., against passage of the Oldfield bill, proposing change in patent law; to the Committee on Patents.

SENATE.

Monday, August 5, 1912.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

Mr. BACON took the chair as President pro tempore under the previous order of the Senate.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. Smoot and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4838) to amend section 96 of the "Act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 7163) authorizing the State of Arizona to select lands within the former Fort Grant Military Reservation and outside of the Crook National Forest in partial satisfaction of its grant for State charitable, penal, and reformatory institutions, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate: